

2021-2022 Academic Senate Minutes
March 22, 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, Chuang, Gomez, Birrer Absent: Walker	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 Kaur read the Land Acknowledgement.

III. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–
 The minutes of March 1, 2021 were approved (45-0-1).

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.

Since our last meeting President Papazian has signed eight policies. One policy was returned to IS&A for reconsideration, F20-2, regarding grading changes.

Chair Mathur is soliciting a General Unit representative for the Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service Committee. Nominations are due March 26, 2021.

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. There will be a celebratory week of events starting April 12, 2021 and culminating on April 15, 2021.

Chair Mathur also continues to work with the President's Office on the Honors Convocation to be held on April 23, 2021. There are over 2,700 President's Scholars.

There is a Legacy of Poetry Event coming up in the next couple of weeks with the theme: "Closing the Distance: Sheltering in Technologies." As a reminder, in 2007 our senate passed a sense of the senate resolution encouraging the university to establish a legacy of poetry day and that support the rich history of poetry at SJSU.

Questions:

Q: Will the honorees from last year's FSR that was cancelled due to COVID be included with this year's FSR recipients?

A: We are going to discuss this in the upcoming meeting to see if there is some way to recognize last year's honorees. We plan to recognize these honorees in some way.

The Senate website is in the process of being migrated to the new accessible format. During this time no new information or changes can be made to the website beginning March 23, 2021.

We are also working with the President's Office regarding the reappointment of Tamar Semerjian as Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR). A message was sent to Senators and feedback is due by March 31, 2021.

Faculty Trustee Romey Sabalius has been chosen as one of two nominees submitted to the Governor for consideration for appointment as Faculty Trustee to the CSU Board of Trustees. The final decision will be made over the summer. Congratulations Trustee Sabalius.

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. For information on Anti-APID/A hate incidents go to "StopAAPIHate." Chair Mathur asked for a moment of silence for those killed in Atlanta. There is a processing space this evening from 7p.m. to 8:30 p.m. hosted by Mosaic and ODEI. Chair Mathur posted a link to the virtual event.

Question:

Q: Do you have any idea how long the Senate website will be down?

A: We will have to get back to you about that. The website was originally supposed to be migrated over winter break, but was delayed. This was not our delay. We hope to be back online within a week, but the Senate Administrator will then have to fix whatever is broken from the move. [Update as of April 13, 2021—Basecamp Barkley has up to 20 Business Days to complete the movement of the website.]

Q: So, we can't access the policies during this time?

A: We have the policies housed other places as well if you need a copy.

B. From the President:

Congratulations Romey. The President is optimistic the Governor will see Dr. Sabalius as the right candidate for Faculty Trustee.

We sent out the announcement about a virtual commencement while we were still in the red tier. The President has asked her team to go back and review commencement to see where we could have some in person events for commencement now that we have moved out of the red tier. We know how important this is for students and their families.

Anti-Asian hate has been rising this year, particularly in our elder communities. A message will go out later today to say we are working to expedite the opening of an APID/A Student Success Center. We know our students need this very much. The President has also asked to spend time

with our API faculty and staff association because she really feels it's important to hear directly from our faculty and staff.

We have continued to work on racial justice. There are a number of things you will start to see. There is a website which will collect all the pieces, probably with a soft launch fairly soon. As part of that Jahmal Williams and Patience Bryant are working with a steering group on a racial justice symposium. We hope this will become an annual event leading to actionable change. Many thanks to Jahmal Williams and Patience Bryant on their leadership in this.

We have been pursuing all the inquiries with regard to Title IX and Athletics. The goal is to understand what has happened over a decade where there was a lot of turnover and change. It is complicated because there has been so much change. We are working with the Chancellor's Office. There is much that the President cannot speak to because of personnel issues. However, the President wants to assure everyone that she is looking into all of this. The questions that have been asked are being addressed.

Questions:

Q: Regarding expediting the APID/A Center can you expand on that?

A: [VP Day] We had a review that started right when the pandemic started. We put it on hold. The President had said this is a priority. We have to sit down and see what we can do by fall. That might be a little bit ambitious. January might be a better goal with reopening. CDO Wong and I will be looking at what makes sense. We will be getting recommendations from students, faculty, and staff. Really of looking at experiences of these students on our campus, one because they are such a large and diverse group of students and it's going to take more than 800 square feet. So the Center is a part of it, but we really have to be talking about a broader strategy, engaging with the community.

A: [President] We need to do something for fall.

A: [VP Day] I guess it will be fall then.

Q: A few weeks ago the AS Board meeting was zoom bombed. You said you were going to meet with them. Can you update us on this and what has been done?

A: [President] We've had two meetings with the AS Board. We worked with them on how to manage the meeting. They've had meetings since then that have went very well. We've also built a communication strategy between the cabinet and the AS Board. We will continue to work hard on that. We will also be talking with them about some of the details regarding Gregory Johnson Jr. where we can.

A: [AS President] We have been having some very productive meetings on how to handle this is a more productive way.

C: While this is fantastic news, I'd love to hear where we go from here with regard to supporting our Native American Students? Will we have a center like the APID/A Center?

A: [President] We have a group working on the issues with our Native American Students. They haven't come forward with recommendations yet. CDO Wong where are we with this?

A: [CDO] From what we are hearing, I think they would like a Native American Student Center.

A: [President] I'll take this back to the team and see if I can drilldown a little bit more information on this.

V. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

EC Minutes of February 15, 2021 – No questions

EC Minutes of February 22, 2021 – No questions

EC Minutes of March 15, 2021 – No questions

B. Consent Calendar:

There was no dissent to the Consent Calendar of March 22, 2021 as amended by AVC Marachi to add Dina Izenstark to the C&R Committee.

AVC Marachi announced the results of the Senate Elections for 2021-2022. She welcomed the new senators.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

VI. Unfinished Business:

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

A. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

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 (Final Reading). The Senate voted and AS 1805 passed as written (45-1-0).***

C: Wanted to commend the committee for putting this forth. It is incredibly necessary to support the diversity of professional and scholarly achievements by our wide-ranging faculty.

Senator Peter asked Senate Cargill to lead the discussion on AS 1803. Senate Cargill presented ***AS 1803, Policy Recommendation, Appointment, Evaluation and Range Elevation for Lecturer Faculty (First Reading).***

Questions:

Q: Overall I like this policy very much. I like it gives lecturers the respect they deserve. I would like to speak to 4.2.3.1.5., unsolicited materials. This is very important. It sends a message that lecturer faculty are valued. This seems to have generated some controversy from what I read in the Executive Committee minutes. However, would the committee consider not removing this clause or watering this down so it becomes meaningless? Because it is very, very important to make sure that those faculty who teach the bulk of our courses, 60% of our classes are not relegated second class status.

A: Thank you very much. We will keep this point in mind while we do the revisions.

Q: In 3.4, careful consideration for reappointment, an earlier draft had some language which spelled out what could be considered careful consideration and that language that seemed uncontroversial has been removed. Can you tell us why?

A: We had much discussion about careful consideration. We had some feedback from university personnel and long discussions about whether that extended language could be used and ultimately decided to remove it. However, I will bring this back to the committee for further discussion.

Q: You mentioned this was going to be a final reading and was changed to a first reading due to some substantive feedback recently, can you clarify why?

A: Some of it was minor and involved current practices, another section had to do with language involved in a case at Northridge and we need to review that information and see if it is pertinent to include that in the final draft.

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

Senator Sasikumar presented ***AS 1809, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Requesting the Appointment of a Presidential Task Force on the Needs of Native Students, Staff, and Faculty (Final Reading)***.

We were fortunate to have as a member of our committee, Professor Soma de Bourbon who is an expert on Native American issues. Senator Sasikumar presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change the 2nd sentence of the 5th Whereas clause to read, "The six-year graduation rate for "all American Indians" is 57.1% (versus 56.8% for URM) in the CSU, and the six-year rate at SJSU was 52.5% (versus 55.5% for URM); and." Senator Wong(Lau) presented an amendment to add a new first bullet under the first Resolved clause to read, "Assess the capacity and institutionalization of accurate identification of native American students with a special focus to aggregate multi-racial/multi-ethnic identified native American students." Senator Wong(Lau) withdrew her amendment in support of the following amendment from Senator Del Casino. Senator Del Casino presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to add a new first bullet under the first Resolved clause to read, "Ensure that we institutionalize the use and analysis of aggregated native and American Indian student data that accounts for the fact that many native and American Indian students are

identified in other racial and ethnic categories.” **The Senate voted and AS 1809 passed as amended (46-0-0).**

Q: I had a question about compensation, whether assigned time or stipend can be provided. Have you had the committee had a conversation with administration regarding this?

A: This is sense of the senate, so we are assuming that the president will consider this.

Q: Would it be possible to consider speeding up the timeline considering how critical these issues are and whether or not it would be possible to establish earlier timeline perhaps fall of 21 rather than spring of 22?

A: We did consider timeline, but we considered with assigned time it would be too disruptive for fall 21.

C: This is an administrative decision, and we hope to have a successful search in American Indian Studies.

Q: Did you consider pulling that gigantic data problem with Native American student identity being aggregated?

C: Yes we had quite a bit of discussion there, we need to look at the data more carefully and ensure that we aggregate appropriately.

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

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

Senator White presented ***AS 1807, Policy Recommendation, Adoption of Guidelines for General Education (GE) American Institutions (AI), and the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) (First Reading).***

C&R has still not finished going through all the feedback they have received. There are over 45 pages. However, C&R wanted to get Senate feedback on the GE Guidelines they have started working on. Most of their time have been spent on upper division GE, areas R, S, and V.

Questions:

Q: My question is how aware is C&R of the nature of the consultation process that the American Institutions Advisory Panel conducted. I mention this because today I talked to a member of that advisory panel that said they were given their charge on the 1st of February and had to finish by the middle of February. These are the most radical changes to the American Institutions requirements I've seen in 31 years at SJSU. I did not know my department had a representative on this group and I'm sure the rest of my department did not know as well until the work was done? Has American Institutions really been thoroughly vetted?

A: I cannot truly answer that question. They should have had at least 6 weeks. The GRPs are under GEAC, but I can reach out and ask what their consultation was.

Q: I would like to join Senator Peter and Senator Wong(Lau) with their concerns with the document forwarded from Communication Studies. I would like to know what the abstentions were about in committee on this resolution? It also seems like we are seeing here in terms of the guidelines is quite a departure from what we saw last year in terms of trajectory for the guidelines. Am I missing something and who made those changes and under what consultation?

A: First, in terms of the abstentions, there two people who abstained. I was one of them. I will not say who the other was. One of the abstentions was due to the instructor qualifications. In the current guidelines it lists instructor qualifications as a Ph.D., but it is not required. A member felt that should be a Master's level or higher. That was a concern. I abstained because I felt that we had not gotten through enough feedback for areas R, S, and V. I felt we could do a better job of looking at the feedback from the GE Summits.

Q: Given the current context of continued racial violence and injustices in our country as well as the historical oppressions in your bi-social groups, Area S is poised to emphasize the importance of diversity in our society and in the context of structured inequality and systemic oppression and disproportionate violations as opposed to individual or cultural group differences among groups it is conceivable that under these revised guidelines an Area S class might study identity and diversity without necessarily attending to the legacy of systemic oppressions and institutionalized discrimination for a variety of groups in the U.S. Would the C&R Committee consider incorporating more explicit language about structural inequalities and institutionalized discrimination by the term structural inequalities and hierarchy of difference? We have also submitted for your consideration specific edits to L02 and L03.

A: Yes, I will definitely take this back to the committee for review.

Q: Thank you to the committee for addressing these issues. I have a recommendation for the committee on the preferences for instruction, I think the terminal degree may not always be the doctorate, it may be the doctorate or terminal degree for the field. Under the instructor qualifications, it should include experience teaching the courses as well as potentially instructional or pedagogical development. The real question is with the incorporation of Area F, which of course locks out an area specific to a narrow set. The reduction in Area D has then increased the pressure on Area C and golden four type courses for additional inclusion as departments are looking at that third realm of politics around FTES. Is there in anything in this document that addresses that, or constrains other areas in ways in response to that or have we remained open?

A: I think what you are asking is can someone teach a GE Area that is not in that particular GE area, so can someone teach a GE Area C1 course that may not have traditionally been in the Humanities and Arts Department?

Q: Have the standards for C1 Changed?

A: Area D has definitely been revised significantly. To be very blunt and honest D1 has gone away. C&R had to bring forward to the Senate a new Area D, because the Chancellor's Office did not like having Area D1, D2 and D3. You will see in the new guidelines there is only an Area D. Areas R, S, and V have also changed significantly. We are proposing that all courses will have to go through a review by GEAC and show they can meet the learning outcomes. The Chancellor's Office has said that Area F must be taught by someone affiliated with that department. All the GE areas, except Area F, have no limits on who can teach them or what programs they come from.

Q: As a result of that we have not responded by withdrawing those from Area D in any way have we?

A: That is correct.

Q: I was one of the people on the American Institutions group. If the other groups were as clueless as we were, this is a problem. We were told we were on the group on February 3, 2021 and we needed to have our feedback in writing by February 17, 2021. We only had one 90-minute meeting. We actually thought we would get this back to go over one more time, but we did not. I think we might want to rethink the timeline on this. How much guidance was everybody given?

A: I can't speak on behalf of the GEAC, but my email correspondence to the GEAC was to get a response by February 24, 2021.

C: What I'm saying is that our group got no guidance from GEAC.

A: There are only two GRPs that were formed.

Q: I'm concerned with the SJSU studies section on the top of page 26. Why are we seeing the variety of disciplines with which SJSU Studies can be met being significantly narrowed?

A: We have not narrowed it. Any department with the exception of Area F can submit a class for any area as long as they can prove they can meet the learning outcomes.

C: Except your use of creative works. Creative works does have a definition. If we look at this LO's individually, creative works does exclude a variety of disciplines.

A: I can definitely take that back to the committee.

Q: As a Senator it would be difficult for me to vote on the whole package at once. I share some of the concerns that Ken Peter brought up. Particularly the vagueness of U.S. 2. Also, the restriction Senator Sullivan-Green brought up regarding creative works. These changes would affect a huge number of classes. I suggest breaking it into pieces to vote upon.

A: I would have to consult with a parliamentarian about the voting and whether we can break the guidelines up. What the Senate votes on is the policy to approve the guidelines. However, there is another way it could be done. C&R could bring a package with only a few key changes this year for

us to vote up and down on, and then bring the rest in a future year. However, that is up to C&R.

Q: You mentioned that we have an exceptionally high number of visitors at this meeting and I believe they are here because they have serious issues with the GE guidelines and we need to have more consultation. The second thing I want to do is urge the Senate to look at the document circulated by Communications Studies. I also want to respond specifically to Senator Okamoto. I teach a course in Area V that would no longer be possible under the revised guidelines specifically because of the creative works of expression. If you look at the last page of the document circulated from Communication Studies, it refers not just to creative works, but also to texts and structures. This would broaden the outline to allow scientific work to be presented in Area V. I also believe we should listen to our colleagues. My colleague who teaches in Area F states that changes to outcomes 3 and 4 in Area F shift the course from the study of inequality organized around a theme to a class about values and dialogue. Grading an assignment based on one's values is difficult, because it is subjective. Also, the word dialogue means different things to different people. This also changes the focus of Area F from self and society to just self. Also, U.S. 2 is now lacking emphasis on civic engagement, demographic changes in California and an emphasis on civil liberties, voting, and civil rights.

A: We will definitely take this back to the committee.

Q: I have two concerns. One has to do with instructor qualifications. I do not believe we should have the doctorate as a preferred requirement because it sends a message that if you don't have a doctorate you are less preferred and many of our lower division classes are taught by those with Master's degrees. I also have some language changes on line 458. This puts the students into two categories. One category for English language learners and another for multi-language speakers. However, English language learners are bilingual or multi-language speakers. Also, on line 464 it lists errors by English language learners but I would not call them errors. They are variations. The assumption here is that only multi-language speakers make errors when speaking, but many native English language speakers make errors so I think we should move away from that. On line 576 there is an editing error. Class size and English speakers. It says "classes that have English speakers are limited to 20," and I believe that is incorrect. Shouldn't it read, "Sections designed for native English speakers are limited to 20"?

A: Yes, I will take this back to the University Writing Committee, since those changes came from them. C&R asked the University Writing Committee, as the University experts, to review and recommend language for those sections.

Q: Can't C&R make changes?

A: Yes.

A: [Frazier] I sit on the University Writing Committee. We did discuss this, but something must have happened in the transition to C&R. This does not accurately reflect what we discussed. However, we didn't have a lot of time.

A: Part of the reason it is not identical is that C&R did make changes.

Q: I would like to raise some questions about Area S. I teach Area S and V classes. Some of the changes in learning objectives for Area S seem to be power evasive, admiring the problem instead of fostering critical thinking, and to have a lack of criticality. I wonder if that was intentional. As an example, learning objective three has gone from, "describe social actions which have led to greater equality and social justice in the U.S." to "describe social actions that have led to something." We are replacing that with a discussion of our own values. That seems very power evasive and very much like admiring the problem and re-centering more of an individualism perspective. In learning objective 4, we replace, "recognizing and appreciating constructive interactions" with "talking about difference." This is again admiring the problem. In learning objective 2, we replace language describing historical, social, political, and economic processes producing diversity, equality and structured inequalities in the U.S." and in a time of Black Lives Matter we are going to change that to "diversity, equity, and inclusion." This is a great name for a department and office that is a change agent on campus, but is not a great critical learning objective. Has the committee considered the impact of these changes and what message this sends to our students at a time we want them to be thinking more critically about themselves within society and issues of inequality in the U.S.?

A: The committee did consider and debate this for some time. It was the consensus of the entire committee that the changes in 3 and 4 are what they wanted.

C: I'm sorry to hear that.

A: So am I.

Q: In the rewording and modification of Area S, what problems was the committee trying to fix? What was the reason for removing structural inequality and other things? It is a huge departure from what was written previously.

A: Are you asking for my opinion?

Q: Maybe asking for some wisdom as to why so much effort was made to change the goals and objectives of Area S?

A: I would defer to any of my other committee members. I was against this and spoke adamantly against it many times in my committee, or I should say the committee I chair. I was not happy with any of the changes in Area S. I also brought up all the feedback we had gotten from instructors in Area S, but the committee chose to go with what was recommended to us initially in January, so I would defer to any of the other committee members. I'm completely against these changes, but I'm one person on a committee. I probably won't vote to bring the guidelines forward if Area S remains the

same. To have LGBTQ and other inequalities removed from this area completely white washes this and makes it a neo liberal white washing that is atrocious. I apologize this is not the view of the committee. It really makes me angry beyond belief that this has been done. It is an atrocity that I cannot stand and do not support.

C: [Anagnos] I want to be clear that the guidelines that were presented are an opportunity to gather input. One of the reasons these changes were made has to do with the learning outcomes. There are nine GE learning outcomes and some of them have to do with self-reflection and self-evaluation, so there was an attempt in reworking this to address some of the overall GE learning outcomes. Now maybe we should eliminate those GE program learning outcomes, because it does not seem that explaining your own values are resonating with the community. However, that is why they were put there. There are learning outcomes that talk about self-evaluation and self-reflection on what you have learned. This can be reviewed by C&R. One of the reason that the lists were removed is that maybe a list doesn't have every identity and by removing the list the area is left more broad. There has been some very good feedback today and C&R can certainly review it.

Senator Frazier presented a motion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the motion carried. The meeting was extended to 5:15 p.m.

Q: Thank you Senator White for the explanation. My constituents have put together a list of edits. I'd like to request that C&R examine putting the lists back in. We feel that intersectionality is lost with removing them. It is not just the list but the idea that there is a vast web of identities and nuances that we live in. Perhaps that language can be changed to show these as examples instead of the alpha and omega. Would the C&R Committee consider incorporating the lists provided? Also, would C&R consider replacing the focus on values to engagement and social actions in Area S?

A: Thank you.

Q: For GE Area S, learning outcome 4, "engage in dialogue about social issues in the U.S.," is it the intent of the committee for this to mean engage in verbal dialogue? If it is verbal dialogue, I am concerned that a student would be put in a potentially vulnerable position because they are being forced to speak out about something very personal to them, or they are being forced to respond to something that was said earlier that is offensive to them.

A: C&R really didn't discuss this, but I will bring it back to the committee.

Q: We discussed this in our last solidarity meeting. The solidarity network collectively denounced the changes made to Area S. We feel it is detrimental to the principles of inclusivity and trying to create a more equitable campus.

C: Thank you.

C: R, S, and V reflect the upper division versions of B, C, and D. I am heartened by the conversation we are having. I do think the whole thing should come back again for a second reading with maybe a time limited discussion on each section and then return for a final reading later. I think we are getting on the right track. I also agree with Senator Wong(Lau) that we need to know why we are doing these changes and not only who it affects, but who is left out.

C: Area F is subject to law and has to be put in place before the end of the semester. The question about whether this is brought back section by section is something we need to take seriously. We will be out of compliance in the fall if we don't have Area F in place and at least one course in it. I think these conversations are great. It does suggest maybe 9 PLOs are too many.

C: As I was listening to the comment about self-reflection being one of the reasons for the changes to Area S, I was thinking self-reflection has to happen in the context of larger unequal structures.

A: I'll bring that back to the committee.

Q: I would like to formally move to refer this back to committee.

A: This is a first reading so it will go back to committee.

Q: I'm concerned that it will come back for a second reading and not be ready. I think the idea of bringing it back in pieces is the way to go here.

Q: I was at the GE summit and remember the discussions about Area R, and Area R is reflective of Area B, and in our discussions there was a lot of talk about having Area R be broader and that seemed to be reflected in the first draft of the guidelines. Can you tell me why this was not applied in Area R in this draft?

A: They were initially applied to Area R and then the committee received additional feedback and it was changed.

Q: Can I ask you to bring it back to the committee and ask them to make it broad again?

A: Yes, I will bring it back to the committee.

C: The fact is that Area B does not require that it be broad. The campus can narrow it down if they want to.

C: I don't think we want to get to a place where we have to do this over the summer by Presidential Directive. We are between a rock and a hard place here because of the law. I think we need to look carefully and make sure they say what we want and they get passed.

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

Senator Sullivan-Green presented ***AS 1808, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy F20-1, Adding Classes after Advance***

Registration (Final Reading). Senator Sullivan-Green presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change, “graduating seniors” to “graduate students” in lines 32, 33, 35, 38 and 43 and in line 41 change, “graduating seniors” to “graduating students.” **The Senate voted and AS 1808 passed as amended (42-0-2).**

Q: Reason for two abstentions in the committee?

A: Some committee members who are not well versed in registration who are electing to abstain.

VIII. State of the University Announcements:

A. Chief Diversity Officer:

B. CSU Faculty Trustee: Report distributed via the Senate Listserv

C. Statewide Academic Senators:

D. Provost:

E. Associated Students President:

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

G. Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA):

IX. Special Committee Reports:

Time Certain: 3:30 p.m., Campus Master Plan Report:

Traci Ferdolage, Senior AVP for Facilities Development and Operations, Jane Lin, Architect and Linda Dalton, Professor Emeritus Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, Dalton Education & Associates presented a report on the Campus Master Plan.

Traci Ferdolage: We have only just begun this process. Campus Master Planning is a multi-year process. Our master plan is designed to build upon Transformation 2030 and serve as a long range planning guide for accommodating projected student enrollment and its related educational research, student support programs as well as various administrative services necessary for the successful operation of the campus. In short, the plan is designed to envision the future physical development of the campus. During the fall semester, our team conducted over 80 hours of interviews with leadership from more than 20 campus stakeholder groups to see what they thought should be addressed in the plan. Stakeholder groups represented students, faculty, and staff from all the colleges and divisions. The purpose of this presentation is to provide the Senate with an overview of the project, and to provide opportunities for feedback and also to explain the schedule a little bit. This is just the first engagement with Senate and there will be many engagement opportunities throughout this process. We encourage each of you to attend the open house and we will speak more to that later. We are very committed to collecting a variety of feedback. Campus Master Planning is one of the biggest planning activities that my team does. I’m deeply committed to collecting a wide range of input that is as diverse as our campus is. I’m going to turn it over to Jane now.

Jane Lin: What is a Campus Master Plan? A Campus Master Plan is a long range planning guide for projecting student enrollment, its related educational, research, and student support programs, as well as the administrative services necessary for the successful operation of the university and envisions the future physical development of the University and its properties. All physical improvements constructed by the University must be consistent with and supportive of the Campus Master Plan. Our time horizon for the project is about 20 years from now. We want you to think big about what the campus can be. It is our intention to be as inclusive as possible. We've just introduced you to the members from FD&O and they are in charge and leading the project. FD&O is working with our consultant team on a daily basis. We also work with the Campus Master Plan Advisory Committee that is Co-Chaired by VP Charlie Faas and Provost Del Casino. The committee consists of 25 members who represent faculty, students, staff, and campus affiliates. We meet with the committee 1 or 2 times a semester. The Campus Master Plan also involves you if you learn, live, teach, and/or work on or near the university. We need your input to make the Campus Master Plan as grounded and complete as possible. The goal of the Campus Master Plan is to build off the strategic plan—Transformation 2030. It is also closely tied to academic and enrollment planning on campus. The Campus Master Plan informs other plans such as South Campus Plan, Utilities Plans, FD&O Plans, Housing Plans, Landscape Plans.

The properties involved in the Campus Master Plan include Main Campus, South Campus, and all associated properties that include campus programming, some of which are not owned by the campus. We are in Phase 1, which is primarily an information gathering phase. At the end of the semester we will present a preliminary background report that summarizes the work we put in Phase 1. We have begun by evaluating the existing plan, and interviewing key stakeholders. The virtual open house that we are presenting about today is a very big part of our information gathering and will give everyone a chance to weigh in on what is important. We will be developing a framework for the plan in the fall. We will also be holding focus groups and workshops in the fall. In Phase 3 we will be drafting and writing the Campus Master Plan and an Environmental Impact Report follows that. In Phase 4 the Campus Master Plan will go to the Board of Trustees for approval.

Linda Dalton: As both Traci and Jane have mentioned, we conducted over 80 hours of interviews. The interviews help provide direction for the Campus Master Plan. They also provide information on the changing nature of teaching, learning, and work on campus. We are particularly interested in how the campus is going to balance between face-to-face, hybrid, and/or remote learning so we can design the right facilities for the future. We were encouraged to develop better connections with the city of San José, and to find a way for the main and South campuses to be safe and welcoming. In

addition, interviewees offer many suggestions such as making ground floor activity much more visible. We were encouraged to include very flexible classrooms. Interviewees also wanted an expansion of food and beverage options both in location and menu. In addition, interviewees wanted a way to bring the South Campus and Main Campus together so they don't feel so separate. Stakeholders encouraged us to be thinking about implementation and as we move along about how to be thinking about making the plan adaptable while ensuring continuity. Jane will now give information on the Open House.

Jane Lin: [A video about the virtual open house was presented.] The virtual open house can be found on the Campus Master Plan website. The website includes FAQs, etc. You can find the virtual open house on the "Get Involved" page. Browse anytime without logging in. You can visit anytime you wish before March 31, 2021. On Wednesday there is one more event for questions and answers. We hope you join us and please tell your colleagues and students to participate in the virtual open house.

Questions:

Q: When I arrived in 1990, we were promised a new College of Social Sciences Building. Is there any thought to unify our academic colleges to create some sense of community?

A: We really do need to understand how we utilize space on campus, and how we will move forward. The comment is incredibly important and we need to have additional discussion about it so that a department or college can be as vibrant as possible. I'm happy to discuss this further as we move forward.

Q: I completely missed the announcement of this virtual open house. This has far reaching implications. Would it be possible to extend the time for collection of feedback?

A: I apologize you didn't get the announcement. What I want to reassure you is that this is just the very first step towards gathering information and establishing a vibrant community feedback loop. The team is planning more in-depth opportunities. This won't be the last time to comment.

Q: As a representative of the Career Center, could we be moved to a more student centered building than the Administration Building? Is there any thought to putting all of student services together?

A: I hear what you are saying and I certainly recognize we are here to support our students. We need to think strategically about how we repurpose space. At the same time, we need to think about what things will look like as we move forward 20 years from now.

Q: What has been the interaction with the Campus Planning Board? Also, we are in these tight budget times so can you give us a ballpark estimate of the consulting costs?

A: We met with the CPB in February and we anticipate we will be meeting routinely to give the CPB updates on the progress of the project. As for the budget, we don't want that to necessarily hold us back right now, but there is a reality and reckoning. This is one reason we have an economist on the planning team. In addition, as we move closer to the end, we will begin to start estimating that cost and start looking at a 10 to 15-year capital investment plan and how we achieve that. Budget is always a concern. Some of our strategies will be renovation and some will be building new building. We will be looking at what the funding mix will be. We recognize we will have to be creative. We will have to think of alternatives sources of funding. We will examine all of this when we get closer to finalizing the plan.

Q: What is the current consulting cost and other costs around this project?

A: The costs for the Campus Master Plan are largely funded from a trust we have on the construction management side of the house. This is a multi-year process. It will run \$3-\$4 million total by the time we get through. Which also requires a full Environmental Impact Report.

C: [Provost] These are system requirements and real costs associated with the process.

X. New Business: None

XI. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 5:10 pm.