

2020-2021 Academic Senate Minutes
March 1, 2021

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

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

III. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–
 The minutes of February 8, 2021 were approved (42-0-0).

IV. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Mathur announced the meeting would be recorded for the purpose of preparing the minutes. Only the Senate Chair and Senate Administrator will have access. Please keep yourself muted unless speaking. Only Senators may speak and vote in the Senate meetings. Roll call will be taken by the Senate Administrator using the participant list, so be sure your full name shows. Please type "SL" to speak to a resolution in the chat. If you wish to speak to an amendment please type "SL Amendment" into the chat. If you have a longer amendment please type it into the chat and send to Senator Marachi.

Chair Mathur asked for a moment of silence for the over 500,000 people in the U.S. who have lost their lives due to COVID including our colleagues from the College of Humanities and the Arts and the Valley Foundation of Nursing and our colleague Debbie Hennessy, Senator Administrator, at CSU Long Beach. Our sympathies go out to members of our community who have lost family, friends and colleagues

This month is Global Spartan Month. We celebrate our international students at SJSU. The College of Professional and Global Education has planned a full month of events that can be found on the International Student and Scholar Services website.

Update on Senate Events:

We have been working with the Accessible Education Center and the Interim Vice Provost for Faculty Success in re-forming the University Council on Accessibility and Compliance. Today is the last day for interested faculty to submit their nomination.

Chair Mathur has been working with Melanie Schlitzkus in the Provost Office on the 22nd Annual Faculty Service Recognition Event. Last year we had to cancel this event due to the Shelter-in-Place Order. This year the event will be virtual and will be held on April 15, 2021 so mark your calendars.

This week we will be celebrating our amazing staff with the 53rd Staff Service Celebration on Thursday. If interested go to the University Personnel webpage and register for the event. One of the winners is Erlinda Yanez, from Chicana and Chicano Studies, whose daughter Jade worked in the Senate office.

The Honors Convocation planning is underway. This event was cancelled last year as well due to the Shelter-in-Place Order. This year there will be a virtual event.

The Senate Office has been working with the web development team to update the website. Our Senate Administrator has been working with the team to ensure the new site contains the critical information we need and meets accessibility requirements.

We are also working with the President's Office regarding the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) review as outlined in university policy and you should be hearing more about this shortly.

Chair Mathur expressed her heartfelt thanks to Vice Chair McKee and the behind the scenes team (Stefan Frazier, Kimb Massey, Roxana Marachi, and Eva Joice) for a wonderful Senate Retreat. This was the first virtual retreat in our history and Chair Mathur has heard many positive comments.

As you know there has been a surge of Anti-Asian violence across the country, within our neighborhoods, and in our city. This has been brought on in many ways by COVID-19. Last spring our Senate passed a Sense of the Senate Resolution, SS-S20-6, that denounces racism and hate crimes against Asian, Asian-American, and Pacific Islanders. We also denounced jokes and terms that specifically target them. We also tasked our faculty, staff, and students with reporting these events whenever they see them especially those involving Asians, Asian-American, Pacific Islanders, who are being targeted during COVID-19. We agreed to stand in solidarity and in opposition to this violence.

Our SJSU Black Male Collective was also attacked during a racist zoom bombing this past Friday. I greatly appreciate the campus-wide message sent out by the CDO about how SJSU administration and staff have reached out to students and others who attended that event to offer counseling and other resources and how the administration will continue to work with the Black leadership and community members to provide support.

Chair Mathur noted that she would like to take a point of privilege as the Chair of the Senate to denounce what she believes is a failing at this university. This is a failure to provide clear Administration support to our Associated Students Board of Directors. This past Wednesday, February 24, 2021, during the AS Board meeting, our AS Board of Directors and campus student leaders were publicly attacked, humiliated, intimidated, and felt threatened by a group of students and community members during their zoom meeting. For nearly two hours these threats continued. These students were called horrific names, accused of wrongdoing, and generally humiliated throughout the course of the meeting. AS student leaders immediately reached out to Chair Mathur and Chair Mathur immediately contacted the Chief of Staff and the President's Office to get assistance. The AS leaders were also trying to contact some of the administration themselves to get someone to come into the meeting to provide some help. They tried to get any assistance they

could. Chair Mathur was told assistance would be provided, but no assistance was provided. In Chair Mathur's role as Senate Chair, she has had the honor to work with the AS Board of Directors and our student Senators. Over this past year, she has been witness to their leadership. Despite their own personal struggles related to COVID-19, they have advocated for students. It was heartbreaking to hear their cries for help and not be able to help them in that moment. In the days following this meeting, Chair Mathur has followed-up with these students and they continue to feel the trauma of being under attack. Social media posts continue to re-traumatize these students. Chair Mathur called upon the administration to provide tangible support beyond, "we hear you, or we are listening." These students had to go into their classrooms the very next day with some of the same students who had been attacking them the previous day. The students are not being asked to share their stories here today. They should not be traumatized again. We need to go beyond hearing them to supporting them. Where was the campus-wide support for our student leaders? It should have come out that day, or the next day. What message are you sending to our student leaders? What message are we sending to those students that have dedicated themselves to service to our campus? Chair Mathur loves SJSU and has always wanted SJSU to be number one in all we do. However, over the last few days, she has felt anger and powerless that SJSU has not done the right thing for these students. We are not number one. If Chair Mathur is feeling this way, then you can imagine how these students are feeling. We need to give them real support, when they are pleading for help. Chair Mathur urged the administration, the University, and Senators to provide tangible support to all our students. Chair Mathur thanked the Senate for listening.

B. From the President:

President Papazian thanked Chair Mathur for her comments. There is more to that story. This is the first that the President has heard from Chair Mathur about this. President Papazian appreciates the commitment to students. She is meeting tomorrow with the AS Board and there have been other kinds of conversations that have taken place. This is for another time and the President did not want to get into this today. However, this has not been ignored. The administration is working with students.

The President acknowledged that it has been a real pleasure to meet with the staff award winners and encouraged everyone to attend the Staff Awards Event this Thursday at 4 p.m. It is really important to recognize those staff members, and all our staff members who have done really extraordinary things.

We have word from the governor's office that they will be restoring the \$299 million that was reduced from the CSU budget last year. This is good news. The rest of the request from the Trustee's budget will move forward. We certainly think we will get some one-time dollars. The numbers coming into

the state office look robust. Whether or not we will see an increase in recurring dollars over the \$299 million only time will tell. Those dollars will be focused on basic needs like the Graduation Initiative and programs that lead to the success of our students.

We had hoped to be a vaccination site for the Santa Clara County, but they decided to go another route and we just learned that this week. We will continue to be available if that changes. Our team is in close contact with the Department of Health and the county.

We are actively engaged in developing the repopulation plan. The Chancellor's Office had hoped to be as in person as possible for Fall 2021. However, we think it will still be something of a transition semester. Certainly the approval of the Johnson and Johnson vaccine over this weekend was a big step. That is a positive step and with the distribution of the vaccine, the numbers are trending in the right direction. However, we still don't know what things will look like in the fall in terms of social distancing and what tier we will be in. We are planning on being somewhere between the yellow and the red tier and having a 75% occupancy rate. We recognize it could end up somewhere between the 50% and 75%. As we get closer and closer to fall we will be able to fine tune that. We are also trying to put together some criteria for what events will look like when the students come back together. We will continue to hold some Town Hall meetings on this so that we can tweak the plan with input from the campus community. We are trying to figure out what makes the most sense for the Commencement for Spring 2021. Different campuses are coming up with different solutions. We are still going to be primarily virtual, but we are going to have a short program that is live. The details are being worked out through Brian Bates and his team. We should have that done sometime this month to allow people to plan.

The Campus Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (CCDEI) is pretty much ready to go and the CDO will speak more to that. We have reached out to all the members of that committee. We do have seven students on that committee so that the student voice will be heard.

News from the Chancellor's Office, Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) Blanchard will be leaving in a few weeks to take on the Presidency at the University of Houston, Downtown. A search will be launched for a new EVC soon.

Questions:

Q: This past AS Board meeting was very disturbing. Many students, alumni, community members and Mrs. Johnson were there to speak at the forum as it is the only public forum for people to speak at the university. People in the community and Mrs. Johnson have not been heard for 12 years. It is more than understandable that the students and Mrs. Johnson are angry. However,

the AS Board meetings are not the place to address the death of Gregory Johnson. As a community, we need to see more forms of accountability from the university. We also need places for the community to address SJSU. In a message to the campus community you said, "The circumstances surrounding Gregory's death are symptomatic of the longstanding systemic racism in our nation." Two questions. What about the systemic racism in our university? Can you address its presence?

To help your student body move forward, how will you heal what has happened in the past, and how will you prevent it from happening in the future?

A: [President] Thank you for the question. I will speak more with the AS Board tomorrow about this. It is clear that systemic racism is a challenge in our society and at the university. We have put together strategies, teams and committees in various areas to address this and we will continue to address this. The addition of Jahmal Williams and the Campus Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion are here to help us think beyond what is on the surface and come up with some solutions. This is something that doesn't get fixed overnight. We need to work with all of you on this. We will have many more conversations on this.

Q: Once you meet with the AS Board and think about some ways to move forward, can the Senate get a report on the next steps and how can we get involved in the process?

A: [President] That's a conversation for the students, and we will take it from there. However, I appreciate the interest here.

Q: My understanding is that the AS Board meetings are occurring every other Wednesday so the next meeting is March 10, 2021. There is reason to believe the same destruction that took place this past Wednesday will reoccur. Specific threats to that effect were made. What are we as a university doing about the format of the meetings to ensure that this does not reoccur?

A: [President] Absolutely, I will turn it over to VP Day who is working on this issue.

A: [VP Day] Obviously, it has been on my mind. Tomorrow when we meet with the students, we will talk with them about some strategies to manage the meetings. I say talk with the students, because it is their meeting. We will talk with them about putting some tools and strategies in place, depending on what they would like. This will allow them to limit some of the things that took place in that meeting, but will still allow them to have open meetings.

Q: My question revolves around the Title IX investigation into the Sports Medicine Director and the statement that the university remains committed to continuing to provide a safe learning environment and will continue to take the appropriate and necessary steps. What specifically has already been done to provide a safe learning environment, given that the Sports Medicine Director

has remained in his position for 10 years since the incident being investigated? My second question is about the allegation that Steve O'Brien was fired out of retaliation for bringing some of the case details to the public eye. Does the administration dispute that claim?

A: [President] As you recall, when this came to my attention I made the decision to refer this and open an investigation. When I looked at this I felt the women involved had not been heard and it was important to me that there be an objective process. A process where those involved were listened to and we would have an outcome and appropriate action would be taken whatever that was. I asked the Chancellor's Office to take this on, and that is how this investigation started. It is complicated and there are lots of players. It takes time. Mr. Shaw isn't with the university any longer. He left. That is just where that stands right now. Certainly, our Title IX Office is involved. Regarding the second part, I'm not going to speak one way or the other on a personnel matter.

There is a comment in the chat I think I need to clear up [about the AS Board Meeting]. Let me just be clear, this was a purely accidental kind of thing. I was sent the wrong agenda and the wrong link. When I tried to get in and log onto the meeting a few minutes before it started, I could not get in. The link was for a personnel meeting on March 22, 2021. I called my assistant and tech support, but by the time they were able to get me the correct link there was only five minutes left to the meeting. I had a hard stop and had to leave and didn't want to show up for only five minutes. There would have been no time to have a conversation, so I asked to be rescheduled for the next meeting. This is what happened.

V. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

EC Minutes of February 1, 2021 – No questions

B. Consent Calendar:

There was no dissent to the Consent Calendar of March 1, 2021 as amended by AVC Marachi.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

Approval of the Senate Calendar of 2021-2022—The Senate voted and the calendar was approved (46-0-1).

Approval of the Election Calendar of 2022—The Senate voted and the calendar was approved (47-0-0)

VI. Unfinished Business:

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

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

Senator Sasikumar presented ***AS 1806, Policy Recommendation, Amendment D to University Policy S15-10, Revisions to SJSU Library Policy (Final Reading).***

Senator McClory presented an amendment to add a new Resolved clause to read, “Resolved that 2.6.2.4. be added: Two members of the Library staff should be added to the membership. These members will serve for staggered three-year terms. All subsequent articles should be renumbered.” Senator Frazier presented an amendment to the McClory amendment that was friendly to the body to delete, “should be added to the membership.” The Senate voted and the McClory/Frazier amendment passed (41-0-5). Senator Marachi presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to add, “Effective: Fall 2021.” **The Senate voted and AS 1806 passed as amended (38-0-5).**

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

C. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R): No report.

D. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA): No report.

E. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

Senator Peter described the use of the Boyer model and ways it has been incorporated into the existing RTP policies. The current policy already provides a lot of flexibility, about the scholarship of engagement, but because it doesn't call it out explicitly by name, because it doesn't identify examples, this policy has not had the effect on shifting the university's culture as much as it should.

Senator Peter presented ***AS 1805, Policy Recommendation, Amendment E to University Policy S15-8, Retention, Tenure, and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and Standards, To Provide for Scholarship of Engagement (First Reading).***

Questions:

Q: Under 2.3.1, where it talks about disciplinary expert, who are we saying is a disciplinary expert? I'm in Social Work, so I'm assuming a disciplinary expert would be in Social Work, but my community engagement is with the HIV Planning Council. These people would probably be the better evaluator of how my research is helping them in the community.

A: It is a good question. Some of this needs to be worked out. The departments need to establish guidelines that will elaborate on that. There is a difference between service and scholarship of engagement. Scholarship of Engagement means using your expertise, so you need to have somebody who shares your expertise to evaluate the value of your expertise. It could be you are going to need to do two things. You may need a letter from the people in the community you are serving, and maybe an external reviewer

who shares your expertise to evaluate the significance and quality of that work.

Q: Might there be in the process of external review or disciplinary experts, suggestions by the candidate that would be taken into account?

A: I think there very well could be and I think that is where department guidelines would outline how an external review is setup. As you may recall we had a first reading of a policy on external review in the fall and what happened is what I feared would happen. There is so much variation on this campus from department to department that any kind of universal policy on external review is bound to fail. I do think that some of the guidelines that PS has already seen and made recommendations about do have provisions for external review in which the candidates nominate reviewers, and chairs and others choose them. That is one model that is being used on this campus.

Q: Applaud the inclusion of licensure. I wonder if we might want to put a note in the service component that may differentiate where service requires a particular level of disciplinary expertise and may also be considered scholarly, professional, artistic work?

A: We can reexamine that. Let me see if this helps though. If you look at the category, professional achievement, the second of the 2.3.3's, we had this issue with professional achievement. This is what we said for professional achievement. Professional achievement will usually be evaluated within the category of service, except when department guidelines establish that professional activities are the primary method of demonstrating expertise within the discipline. That is how we finessed it within the category of professional achievement. However, scholarship of engagement is a little bit different, because we wanted to make the argument that it is a form of scholarship and it is very likely that a person going up for tenure or promotion might have a piece of conventional scholarship in an empirical journal and might also have something that fits the scholarship of engagement and they are both different aspects of scholarship. We don't want to say to a candidate that unless your department has guidelines, scholarship of engagement won't count except in service. Trying to get the right dividing line between service and scholarship of engagement is always difficult. We can try and beef up that explanation, but the main distinction has to do with the application of expertise. If it is something you could do without your expertise or doctorate, just as a volunteer, that is service time. When you serve on the Academic Senate, for the most part we are serving as members of the academic community. You can serve on the Academic Senate regardless of what your academic expertise is so that clearly is service. However, if you are applying your expertise and that is something that can only be done because of your expertise that could become the scholarship of engagement.

Q: If there is any way the difference between scholarship of engagement and service could be added in here as a descriptor to guide candidates as to

when it is service and when it is scholarship of engagement, that could be critical. Would the committee consider this?

A: That has been the problem for 30 years. Many books have been published for 30 years on how to make that distinction. If you have any language, we would be happy to consider it.

Q: Thank you. I'm trying to jump the gun I know that. Is there a plan to bring this forward again soon as I'm thinking of candidates going up next year?

A: We shall see. Part of the first reading was to gauge. I think the questions and suggestions that have come up so far are doable. We'd like to get this done this year. The committee also got a lot of suggestions for equity reform. That one looks more substantial. That one is probably going to take a longer reform effort and come back next year, but if we can handle the suggestions that are coming in and have been coming in it would be nice to get this one adopted this year. As you know, because of the way the contract works, any changes have to be on the books before the next cycle begins. The President would have to sign this prior to August. The hope is to get the scholarship of engagement adopted this year. We will see what all of you think.

Q: Concern about value judgements. Here are two hypothetical situations. Someone from your department is approached by say Donald Trump to provide expertise on political strategies from winning elections, does that piece of work and gets a ringing endorsement. Let's say the advice provided was extremely rigorous and worthwhile, just towards an end we may not appreciate. How would an RTP committee deal with this type of conflict between what may be rigorous application of scholarly expertise, but has ends that are undesirable?

A: I'm stretching my imagination to think anyone in my department might be approached in such a way, but the answer goes like this. Obviously, a letter from former President Trump testifying to the expertise of a SJSU political scientist who gave him the winning strategy that would not be sufficient. You would need to have a disciplinary expert evaluate the work. There would need to be some other political scientist somewhere who wouldn't be evaluating it from the standpoint of who won or who lost, but evaluating it from the viewpoint of an innovative application of political science for a particular election, and whether the work pioneered new ground in understanding how to run a campaign or not. I think you can find a similar example in every department on campus. You do begin to run into those academic freedom issues. The RTP policy is very explicit about avoiding personal bias in evaluating other people's work and I think the earlier sentence we added to the preamble about, "The overarching principle should be to reward significant scholarly academic professional achievement regardless of the form it may take," further reinforces this notion that we are looking at the scholarly achievement regardless of the form it takes.

Q: Would it be feasible in some way either through the Senate or somewhere else to have a list of the different types of scholarship of engagement? This

may look very different from department to department. If new professors could see this list it might stimulate some ideas about how to frame their own dossiers in a way that highlights scholarship of engagement.

A: That is a great idea and not to create work for other people, but should this pass, it would be a perfect opportunity for faculty development to start putting together sample portfolios and dossiers. I will say that this university has a number of traditional departments, but also an increasing number of non-traditional departments. In some of the less traditional parts of this campus, this will not be such an unusual concept. Some departments may even choose to hire people who will have a lot of success in the scholarship of engagement. This may be something they look for as they seek to build their departments.

C: [Provost] The scholarship of engagement emerges as a challenge to logical positivism particularly in the social sciences where who the author is and who the data collectors are were challenged by things like participatory action research where all of a sudden you are co-authoring research questions with “research subjects.” That kind of blew up the paradigm of Science. There were a lot of schools that were like this is not real research and they cut it out. One of the key components that comes out of this is impact and how we measure that. That is different from service and goes back to disciplinary expertise. I think we need to highlight impact. A lot of scholarship of engagement articles are put in peer review journals, they just aren't the journals that are typical to a political science or geography department for example. If you were at a research university, a department might exclude those as not scholarship. That still happens very commonly. We want to embrace the opportunity to be much more holistic, but that doesn't mean you don't need the rigor of some level of peer review and evaluation of the impact of the work otherwise it is very hard to understand how your disciplinary expertise was applied. That is a key component that needs to be worked out and I would agree 100% that department guidelines are tremendously helpful here. We don't have department guidelines in all our departments and I think it is time we do. This is a good first step. And some of that info about impact actually covers all three areas of professional achievement. To the last point, we definitely have to train people on what this looks like, how you put a file together based on this work, how do you document impact. I'm really excited about this. I think we will get there. We will really have to work on the implementation.

C: I should add this was Senator Del Casino's referral that we take this up. We really appreciate his direction in this way. I do have a counter question for him. One issue with the word “impact” is that it invokes the cost of the invoke factors in traditional journals so we have been looking for other words such as significance or something or another, if anything occurs to you let us know.

A: [Provost] None of these words are perfect. Purdue, being one of the leaders of this, says journal citations are one measure of impact but it isn't always a good one. It is imperfect. The nomenclature has to be

operationalized and we have to be satisfied with that. However, it is common language like in the National Science Foundation and National Institutes of Health which demand you now outline broader impact of your work which is beyond the scholarship so that might be one place to look, but what did it do to actually address the issue and maybe change the world a little bit. That was a new thing and it wasn't taken as seriously and it's grown to be taken more seriously now at places like the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health. We will have to come up with the SJSU definition and then come up with guidelines and training. It is a great question. I appreciate it.

C: I want to thank the committee for line 158. And the phrase or the term public scholarship, I always referred to it as public facing scholarship, but I think that helps around scholarship of engagement. I think this is not only a cultural paradigm shift that that is going on but also a generational shift. I think it will become more common to see this as we hire more young professors.

Q: I'm wondering if there is a way to address the issue of scholars trying to apply some of this research in a discipline that maybe doesn't have extensive literature so the research isn't respected, so they apply it in another discipline. Maybe there is a way to acknowledge that. For people who aren't experienced at evaluating this type of work may see this as less than. I'm wondering if there is a way to address the interdisciplinary nature sometimes of this work?

A: It certainly sounds like it might be useful to insert a reference in the early part similar to professional achievement and scholarship of engagement that says, "requires the application of disciplinary and interdisciplinary expertise" perhaps. We will talk about that. We are aware a lot of this is interdisciplinary.

C: I'd like to make a comment about the language of impact. There is an entire social impact space right now that is burgeoning with non-profits and public-private partnerships in an area that has received a lot of critique around the problematic use of the word impact metrics, so if there is any way to provide clarity around the word "impact," maybe you could use "reach."

VIII. State of the University Announcements:

A. Statewide Academic Senators:

The ASCSU will be meeting March 17-19, 2021. We continue to work on implementing AB 1460. Other resolutions/issues under discussion include dedicated seats for lecturers, faculty burnout/angst over repopulation efforts, faculty and staff stress over being caretakers for multiple family members (e.g. parents/children), pay equity when comparing administrator salaries with faculty and staff salaries (e.g. \$350,000 salary for EVC and \$6,000 monthly housing allowance when faculty and staff get no housing or allowance, analysis or shared costs incurred expenses related to working from home.).

Other discussions/issues included GWAR, grading symbols (no suspension of EO 1037), and the rejection of the National Council of Teacher Quality Report.

Questions:

Q: Why is there resistance to the dedicated lecturer seat?

A: Part of it is the culture of the ASCSU. Some people get into an ASCSU seat and feel it belongs to them. The resolution was defeated by only one vote. Some of the issues had to do with the way the lecturer would be elected, the title, and rotation off the Senate. We did share campus feedback but we can share again so please send your comments. Three key issues: lecturers are the overwhelming majority of faculty, so how would you get representation, reference to contingent faculty (as linked to enrollments in the CBA), and rotation (it would prevent people from being re-elected).

C: One of the issues is representation and the question is do you carve out room from the existing group or do you add to the group? Some campuses still don't even allow lecturers on their Senate.

Q: Fifteen years ago, I was on the ASCSU, there were a number of lecturers. Instead of having dedicated seats, why not consider requiring all campuses to allow lecturers to run for campus seats. Has this changed?

A: I'm not sure there has been change, but the current number on the ASCSU is low. One suggestion is to meet with lecturers.

B. Provost:

We have a Townhall meeting coming up for the Division of Academic Affairs on repopulation efforts for Fall 2021. Letter sent out last week about fall planning.

It is time to start faculty reviews and the Provost is eager to get started on them.

The Provost is working on getting faculty hiring memos to the Deans. Think about next phase of the three-year planning and where we need go. Pushing very hard for what we will need for Ethnic Studies, Area F to bring leadership into that space.

We are continuing the Public Voices Op-Ed project for the next three years and continuing the contract.

The Provost launched season two of his podcasts with faculty on Friday. He thoroughly enjoyed making these last year and is so looking forward to another year. It is really about learning about the origin stories of our colleagues and hearing their voices.

Searches have been started for several leadership positions such as the Dean of the Library and the Vice Provost for Faculty Success. And we have several reviews of administrators going on.

This summer we will continue to have another large round of faculty training like we did last year to assist faculty with their online and hybrid classes. We have committed the resources. Cares Act has done a lot to assist us to help provide this training.

The Provost recently sent the Senate Office a referral to get rid of the University Sabbatical Committee. Sabbaticals are best reviewed by the colleges and we want to give as many sabbaticals as possible.

Questions:

Q: When we talk about modes of instruction generally, we talked about in person, online and hybrid, there is another model called high-flex (hybrid flexible). Are we going in this direction, given that this doubles the work for instructors?

A: [Provost] I don't know about doubling the workload. However, this is not feasible for us for Fall 2021. We are not in a position to push high-flex classes, but we won't stand in the way either. There are ways to do this without doubling the workload. It takes effort and planning, definitely not pushing this on our campus.

Q: Can you give me an update as to when AS will receive a response to the resolutions that were sent to you about three months ago regarding proctoring and COVID?

A: [Provost] I just haven't gotten to them. I apologize. We have discussed a lot of things, but I haven't been able to sit down and write a response. It has to do with getting people away from high stakes exams, which is a challenge pedagogically. Yes, looking at some of the answers to some of those questions so hopefully this month.

Q: Many graduate programs on campus are moving from theses to projects due to the timeline. The thesis timeline is early for a two-year Master's program. Is there any discussion about changing these timelines?

A: [Provost] This is the first I've heard the question. I'll look into this and get back to you.

C: [d'Alarcao] We are looking at ways to make it easier for students, provide more flexibility. Looking at the thesis approval process in our office, making it faster and so that there is a higher capacity to do review. Looking at this holistically. We are working on getting graduate students writing earlier.

C. Associated Students President:

AS still does not have a signed 2020-2021 budget back from the President.

The last AS Board meeting left the board members feeling traumatized. The members were subjected to humiliation and ridiculed, and were told they had blood on their hands. AS feels the university should refrain from calling itself the most transformative university, when 13 students felt like their safety was not being prioritized. None of the administration came to the support of the AS Board members during this meeting as requested by numerous board members throughout the meeting. In the wise words on Elaine Welteroth, there is no glory in a grind that literally grinds you down to dust.

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

The VPAF is putting together the budget guidelines over next few months

The Science building is moving forward. They have been working through issues identified by the Fire Marshal.

The AS House has been cleared by the Fire Marshal and is now being painted.

The International House and Audiology space in Sweeney are undergoing some upgrades.

E. Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA):

Our enrollment is up by 223 students from last year, but who these students are is not the same as it was last year. We have spent a lot of time in enrollment campaigns. There are way more transfer students. We have spent lots of time working on admissions for Fall 2021. There were lots of concerns about safety from parents. We continue to move forward.

Good news on COVID testing. Our students have done a great job of social distancing. With our COVID testing we have a .67 positivity rate. That is less than 10 students who have tested positive for COVID. We will continue to do surveillance testing over about 10 to 15% of the population randomly throughout the Semester, but beginning this particular semester less than 1% of students tested positive.

We are looking to create more study spaces for students in the Student Union, but student didn't use them as much as anticipated when we have opened up some spaces. Share information from the report from the National Center of Collegiate Mental Health in use of services. We have also had similar findings with some decline in the utilization of services. This seems to be a national phenomenon. We are still doing outreach, offering one-on-one experiences and group experiences

We will have about \$15 million from the CARES Act to distribute to students based largely on Free Application for Student Aid (FAFSA). We will try to give to other groups as well. Try to get out those monies as quickly as possible.

Question:

Q: When will we get to see the Campus Policing Taskforce Report?

A: We have set a date as before the end of the semester. They are aiming for right after spring break. Still have some decisions about format and feedback and language within the report.

F. Chief Diversity Officer:

The CDO gave an update on the racist Zoom bombing during the SJSU Black Male Collective meeting. The CDO's across the CSU have been advised that these attacks are a concerted effort across the U.S. to create fear and terror. Administrators and staff have been reaching out to students. Information Technology (IT) is looking at the zoom platform. We did work with the university police immediately over the weekend and so we're just looking at what sort of patterns might be there, and if there's a national implication in terms of the patterns. We need to train staff and students on how to setup zoom meetings to avoid this and manage participation. We are involved with the solidarity network and other groups and thinking about how we are supporting with infrastructure. Scheduled two training on how to handle microaggression is scheduled for MPPs. In addition, the Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion will also be discussing this issue. Dr. Patience Bryant and the CDO will be working on a process aimed at equity and systemic racism within our Greek organizations (not just leadership, but also for members). The President's team is working through different initiatives and demands (VPSA, Chief of Staff). A spreadsheet is being compiled of all the requests/demands made to the President and leadership so that progress can be tracked and reported on.

The CDO has been meeting with different groups on campus and discussing the results of the Campus Climate Survey.

Questions:

Q: Related to the Zoom bombing incidents, are we aggregating data at a system level? Is the federal government involved and taking action?

A: The Chancellor's Office and the CDO's are looking at these incidents and whether we need to collect more information in a systematic way. The Chief of Police has reached out to the FBI, Civil Rights division. These groups have been on the radar for some times, common methodology, common images. Their tactics involve heinous images such as hangings and pornography. All in process.

Q: Have there been recommendations for Zoom like using waiting rooms, permissions,? Is there something else we should be doing?

A: The use of waiting rooms and webinar is important. The difference is these are public events. Some of this is in Time, Place, and Manner. The

Administration talked a lot about pushing people into waiting rooms. There are strategies we can use such as making people register.

Q: Since these events will be by Zoom, have you thought about the intersection about Academic events related to things like doctoral dissertation defenses. Is there some guidance? Are we taking any preventive measures for these kinds of events?

A: What we need to do is address this at the cabinet level and come up with a best practices document. Lots of people are not especially adept at using Zoom. Solidarity network and other groups are looking at this as well.

C: Many don't have a clear understanding which events and meetings are private and which must be public so there is a level of unaccountability. There are the California public meetings laws. Need to develop some best practices around these events as linked to public vs. private.

G. CSU Faculty Trustee:

Report distributed via the Senate listserv.

IX. Special Committee Reports:

X. New Business: None

XI. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:48 pm.