

2021-2022 Academic Senate Minutes
April 19, 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 Absent: Khavul
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, Raman Absent: None
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 Wei-Chien Lee read the Land Acknowledgement.

III. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–
 The minutes of March 22, 2021 were approved (43-0-0).

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. One correction to agenda, AS1807 has an incorrect title. The title should be, “Amendment D to University Policy S14-5 Modification of Guidelines for General Education (GE), American Institutions (AI), and the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR).”

Chair Mathur noted that the we are still under content freeze for the Senate website. The senate administrator is working closely with the website team to ensure that we can get our new website up and running as fast as possible, however we are not able to post anything onto our site, including the resolutions. Our senate administrator, Eva Joice, is working with the Barkley team to ensure that our Senate website is moved into the new template as easily and smoothly as possible, there are probably going to be still some bumps and things that are missing.

The President signed the amendment to the RTP policy that included “scholarship of engagement.” We have also sent the Sense of the Senate resolution requesting a Presidential Task Force on the Needs of Native Students, Staff and Faculty to the President.

Chair Mathur is soliciting a representative to serve on the CSU Academic Council of International Programs, it is a three-year term. Tenure-track and tenured faculty are eligible for this advisory body to the statewide Office of International Programs, which was established by the Board of Trustees. Please direct interested faculty to the email that was sent two weeks ago, nominations are due April 26, 2021.

Chair Mathur and Vice Chair McKee have sent out a message to the new Senate to solicit senate officer nominations. Please reach out to either one of them for individual discussions if interested in leadership within the senate. Deadline for nominations is April 23, 2021.

We are in the celebration of APID/A Heritage Month and there are many events in this month brought to you by a wide variety of co-sponsors, including the Asian American Studies Program, the APID/A Task Force, Mosaic Cultural Center, Student Affairs, Campus Life, Student Union. Please

go to the Mosaic website and check out some of the events that are happening in the next couple of weeks.

We also have Honors Convocation coming up on this Friday April 23rd. The event is going to be live-streamed. We will be recognizing over 2700 President's scholars this Friday, 4pm.

Please take a moment right now to have a moment of silence to for Duane Wright and Adam Toledo who were recently shot by members of law enforcement, as well as for the victims of the mass shooting in Indianapolis that killed eight people, including several members of the Sikh community. We hope that one day these shootings, these hate incidents that are part of our lives become part of our history, and not part of our present. Our thoughts go out to these communities, to these families. The President did send out a message yesterday with resources, please use them if you're experiencing stress or trauma.

B. From the President:

President Papazian congratulated all of our faculty who were recognized at the Faculty Service Awards and as well as our Outstanding Faculty Award winners. These incredible group of faculty, some who've been here 15 years and others 40 years, shows you the impact that is clear on an institution. Congratulations to each of them and kudos to our Outstanding Faculty.

Congratulations also to our students who will be recognized at the Honors Convocation. They have had the spirit of challenges, they've been resilient and they have taken on those challenges they faced this year. They found ways to be successful, so we hope many of you and your colleagues can join in for the convocation to celebrate these students.

President Papazian spoke to two sobering messages she had to send out within the last week and wanted to acknowledge both of them. One of the messages was sent out last Thursday, which was the report to the campus community about findings from a re-investigation of an incident that happened in 2009-2010 of sexual misconduct. The letter is posted on the FYI website and you can go back to that any time as a reference and it includes an executive summary of findings while respecting the privacy of our students. We have also begun working with an external investigator to help us understand what happened. In terms of investigation itself in 2009 and what happened in the intervening years, it's been 12 years since, and we want to understand all of the processes and all of the issues. That is in the hands of an external investigator and there's not really much more the President can say. If you or anyone you know, has information we really appreciate your sharing it with our investigator and the contact information is posted. An FAQ will be posted, because we know there are questions out there and we're

hoping to get that ready. It will be posted on the FYI website before the end of this week.

The other message the President sent out was about was the recent shootings in Chicago, Indianapolis, Minneapolis and since then we have had more in Texas and in Colorado. It seems every day we have another tragedy that is bringing anguish to the families and our communities. The Derek Chauvin trial just wrapped up and it's now in the hands of the jury. None of us knows, ultimately, what the jury will come back with, but we are very much aware that this will be challenging whatever the outcome, for so many of our students and our campus community members. We are looking at ensuring that there are resources available and Kathy can speak more perhaps to some of those resources. These are challenging times there's a lot going on, just trying to provide as many resources as possible there and as much information that we can.

The other issue, of course, that we're spending a lot of time addressing is the repopulation plans and the changing guidance that we're getting from the state in terms of the rainbow of tiers, which it looks like the governor has told us, will disappear come mid-June.

Today is the first day that all Americans 16 and above are eligible for vaccines, which means our students are eligible to be vaccinated. Our hope is that as many of them who can will be vaccinated.

The President had a meeting this morning with the Labor Council which has representatives from each of our unions. We had a really productive conversation around some of their concerns. Their members are strongly supportive of requiring vaccines, because faculty and staff are worried, you have so much traffic in and around campus. This may be something that the CSU Chancellor's office will be working on and is working with the Governor's office in terms of the right strategy. Campuses around the country have been widening their rules and we are hearing it from many directions.

Please share any concerns with senate executive committee members. We will have a chance to follow up again in the next week or two. We're working through all of the unions to get feedback from their members and really want to understand the issues, and bring our perspective back to the discussions that we're having at the Chancellor's Office. We anticipate that's happening in other conversations that our statewide senators are having and these conversations are happening in different venues.

We are still also working through all of the other repopulation issues. Our faculty has been very involved, our chairs, in particular, our associate deans and others in trying to finalize an academic schedule so that our students can make plans and so that our faculty can make plans. It continues to be

something of a moving target but we're working on ensuring that there is space between classes, so that the air circulation can happen. What we're learning is that air circulation in some ways, is the most important factor, more so, even than the touching of spaces.

Traci Ferdolage is our CalOSHA rep who is tracking this information. This is opening up other kinds of conversations. We're looking at gradual repopulation of staff to campus as well as faculty. We're not going to flip the switch one day and say everybody has to be here. There's going to be a process and all the units are working with their managers. Traci's team is working to evaluate the spaces, the density of the spaces, the flow of the spaces. The primary factor is what is it that students need to be able to learn and succeed, how are we supporting the student needs. We have learned that some virtual experiences, like mental health counseling, we can actually reach a lot of students. It will be a gradual phase-in to get people used to it again, to begin this repopulation.

We have been away for months, we want to make sure that that each area is attended to. Additional questions that are going to come up because this will happen over the course of the next weeks and into the summer months when the Senate isn't meeting are things like travel policy, study abroad, events. What kind of events will be available, what will be the criteria for those events. How can external volunteers and others come to campus and work on campus and so we're trying to break down these as much as possible. We can hear your concerns or suggestions. We are trying to come up with a strategy that is consistent, that puts health and safety first, that supports our students and that ensures that our faculty and staff can work and thrive and be safe.

We will continue to post on our Adapt website. Our Adapt plan has continued to guide us. It is based and aligned with the colors of the tiers, but we don't know whether those will disappear. Vaccination requirements, we don't have any final guidance. There is a lot of attention being paid to this issue at the Chancellor's level. They are looking at all of the legal requirements, what are we allowed to do and what aren't. Certainly up until a full authorization, we don't anticipate requiring it, because when you have an emergency authorization it is a different status. We are starting to hear, though, that it is likely we may get some full authorization of Pfizer first, then Moderna. This may happen over summer, which would mean we will be in a different place in August, as we move back into the full semester. Nothing firm yet, it is still in process, but we anticipate and we're hoping that we can require vaccinations for students, for example, living in the residence halls. There is also discussion about that for things like intercollegiate athletics, people who work in laboratories work, certain kinds of risk. Think about Hammer Theater performances, other units and their events. The question is what will ultimately the framework be, in that the Chancellor's office will guide us in

terms of what we can do. We may get some directions from the state as well and from the governor's office.

The President has heard a lot of sentiment in favor of requiring vaccinations, even if we were to do so it would be a self-report because of privacy issues. We would ask people to confirm vaccination and there will still be the factors of testing and contact tracing. Managing the move from a pandemic to an endemic situation where there will still be outbreaks. We will continue to update Senate Executive committee over the summer until Senate is back in session.

Questions:

Q: Question regarding the student union, auxiliary budgets, and the operating agreement that needs to be signed by June 30th. Timing, what happens if the budget is not signed by June 30th?

A: [President] Those conversations are taking place and we're working and will be working with the teams to move forward. It is very much on our radar and it is in process. Patrick do you want to speak to this, then Charlie?

A: [VP Day] Charlie and I just left a meeting about this trying to sort of figure out the pathway to get there. I think we are so far able to move forward on our other auxiliaries. We want to make sure that we are able to move this forward in time so that they can do what they need to do. That is our goal to be able to wrap that up so we all close out the year together.

Q: If and when there is a vaccination requirement, will there be a path for those who need an exemption?

A: [President] We have that already. There will be a process through UP for faculty. For students, perhaps through the health center. There are many reasons that people need an exemption, so we will be sure that there is a process.

V. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

EC Minutes of March 15, 2021 – No questions

EC Minutes of April 5, 2021 – No questions

B. Consent Calendar: None

C. Executive Committee Action Items: None

VI. Unfinished Business: None

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

A. Instruction and Student Affairs (I&SA):

Senator Sullivan-Green presented ***AS 1814, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy F20-1, Adding Classes After***

Advance Registration (Final Reading). Due to errors in the previous version of the revised policy, we elected to pull the policy back, make corrections, and bring back to the Senate for vote. Senator Sullivan-Green presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change “Undergraduate Studies” to “Undergraduate Education” in line 31. **The Senate voted and AS 1814 passed as amended (45-0-1).**

Questions:

Q: If this is about graduate students, why are graduating seniors included in the discussion?

A: This is the full policy language to provide more clarity as we to what we are changing. We just made the changes for graduating graduate students and then there was the one correction on line 37, using the more formal language instead of ‘add period’ using ‘advance registration.’

Senator Sullivan-Green presented ***AS 1815, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy F20-2, Grading Changes to Support Maximum Flexibility for SJSU Students During the Prolonged COVID-19 Pandemic (Final Reading)***. Context to new version. Original amendment removed reference to Spring 2021, and added language that converts WU to NC. President Papazian returned the policy to request to removal of language referencing Summer 2021. **The Senate voted and AS 1815 passed as written (41-2-1).**

Questions:

Q: After students graduate their transcript is locked. What is the impact of this retroactive winter inclusion on those grades for students who have actually graduated? Or does that fall into the language of “legally permissible”?

A: I believe that falls into the word legally permissible. I will say that Marion Yao is part of our committee and did not raise this as an issue when we were discussing it either at the beginning of the semester or more recently.

Q: The registrar's website still has the old language up saying that for spring 21, WU grades will be changed to a W. Will the registrar's office or AARS be extra lenient with requests for late withdrawals to accommodate current communication with students?

A: In the original policy, there are still the statements about maximum accommodation when it comes to withdrawals. AARS and the registrar's office will still be operating under those expectations.

C: Typically, AARS does work with individual students to meet their individual needs. In terms of ensuring that they get good advising and making sure that they are as lenient as they are able to be within the confines of the university policy and the executive orders from the Chancellor's Office.

Q: Why was winter acceptable to be included in this policy, when winter is presumably on the same basis as summer?

A: The justification for including winter was unclear, the President was just in support to that addition, but there was also mentioned that summer 20 had no accommodations. For consistency summer 21 should not be included as well.

B. Professional Standards (PS):

Senator Peter asked Senate Cargill to lead the discussion on AS 1803. Senator Cargill presented ***AS 1803, Policy Recommendation, Appointment, Evaluation and Range Elevation for Lecturer Faculty (Final Reading)***. Professional Standards has brought this forward for two first readings and received a lot of good feedback. The main revisions that we have done are the section that addresses the range elevation where we remove the reference to terminal degrees and to the appointment section where we inserted the reference to the terminal degrees and the criteria of evaluation. We made it clear that lecturer faculty are to be evaluated solely on their appointment. In addition, we removed some obsolete provisions and updated the outdated language. An amendment was proposed to add to line 248, “at a minimum, careful consideration means that a department must carefully review all the information available in a candidate’s Personnel Action File (PAF). This will, in most cases include the SOTES, peer evaluations, and other periodic evaluations.” An amendment to the amendment was proposed to include, “the relevant” information to line 249. This second-order amendment was considered friendly. The senator withdrew this whole amendment, and replaced it with, “at a minimum, careful consideration means that a department must carefully review the relevant information within the most recent review period available in a candidate’s Personnel Action File (PAF). This will, in most cases include the SOTES, peer evaluations, and other periodic evaluations.” An amendment to the amendment was proposed to include, ‘at least’ to line 249. This second-order amendment was considered friendly. The senate voted on the amendment and the motion passed (31-12-2). An amendment was proposed to change “peer evaluations” to “direct observations of teaching.” This amendment was friendly to the body. **The Senate voted and AS 1803 passed as amended (45-1-1).**

C: This change has been a long time coming. Nearly three years on this policy, and I certainly hope that we will pass this and we send it forward, but I would like to say a few thank you’s to many of the people who have contributed to it along the way. The composition of Professional Standards has changed some over the years, Professor Cargill has been a part of it all along. As a lecturer formerly herself and as a department chair she's brought a very valuable perspective to the drafting. As we're wrapping up this policy, Senator Kahn contributed mightily to meeting and special sessions in January, helping us to see things from the lecturer’s perspective, but the whole Lecturer’s Council gave us dozens of suggestions. In addition, James Lee and Joanne Wright both reviewed

drafts of this and gave us many suggestions. We took many of them, not every one, but we certainly value the time that they put into helping us see this policy from the administrative perspective. Someone who isn't with us today but who contributed enormously to this in the first two years of the drafting was Carl Kemnitz and you will see his fingerprints all over parts of this policy, as he brought a very high level of expertise to the draft of this policy. I thank all of these people for their contributions over the last several years and urge that you support passage of the revised lecturer policy.

Senator Peter presented ***AS 1812, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Expressing Support for Reform of RTP for Fairness, Equity, and Inclusion, To be carried out by the Professional Standards Committee AY 2021-2022 (Final Reading)***. As many of you know, we have been working on reform of our RTP policy this year, and thanks to you and the President one portion of that reform has already been accomplished. This portion was the expansion of the definition of scholarship that was recently signed. Back in February we brought a tentative first reading about the service component and having to do with a close examination of how the RTP policy might be reformed in terms of the criteria and standards relating to service. The response of the Senate at that time was that it needs to go a lot further. In addition to taking that further, we also need to look at academic assignment and other dimensions of the policy. It became quite clear that a much broader effort was needed, and much more consultation than was possible between February and now. What we have done is we have tried to memorialize the work that we have done so far on this topic. We are asking for your endorsement of a reform effort to continue through next year. A correction Senator Smith was part of the vote, and the vote was 11-0-0. **The Senate voted and AS 1812 passed as written (41-0-4).**

Senator Peter presented ***AS 1813, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Endorsement of The University of Chicago Statement on Freedom of Expression (Final Reading)***. San José State has its own policy on academic freedom, and it is modeled after the AAUP statement that was first issued in 1910 and then again in 1944. But since those days, probably the most eloquent statement in support of academic freedom was written by a committee of the University of Chicago in 2014. Since it was published in 2014 more than 100 universities have endorsed the statement and Professional Standards would like our Academic Senate to also endorse the statement. As many of you have noticed over the last few years, academic freedom has come under a great deal of threat from across the political spectrum, a number of Conservative groups have championed the Chicago statement. But more recently we've been hearing from groups at the other end of the spectrum. I forwarded to you the articles about what's happening in Idaho today where the state

legislature of Idaho is cutting off funding to Boise State and forcing it to cancel classes, some mid-semester, because they have too much diversity content. Attacks from the right and from the left abound when it comes to academic freedom and there needs to be a place, namely the university, where these issues can be vigorously debated. An amendment to the resolution to add, "and the attached 2014 University of Chicago statement" to line 37 was proposed. The amendment was friendly to the body. **The Senate voted and AS 1813 passed as written (36-4-4).**

Senator Sasikumar presented a motion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the motion carried (37-5-3). The meeting was extended to 5:15 p.m.

C: I just wanted to add my voice to Senator Peter's very eloquent expression of why this is so critical and I want to thank him for his work and the committee for its work, Professional Standards. I can't think of a more important issue in Higher Education generally and to SJSU specifically. It and issues of tenure, when you're also coming under fire, are absolutely fundamental to the functioning of a healthy operation of any university and the ability of the professoriate to do their jobs with a minimum of interference and maximum of protection. I just think this is what a university is all about, so I wanted to add my voice to that.

C: Thank you Senator Peter and the Professional Standards committee. I greatly appreciate this coming forward. Being an institution that is basically established to promote intellectual pursuits this statement of having freedom of expression and freedom of debate is critical to what we do in everyday with our students. Having this suppressed would be a critical loss of the real essence of academia, so I strongly encourage support of this resolution.

C: Thank you, Senator Peter, and I appreciate Professional Standards and what you're trying to do here in terms of the supporting academic freedom. I'm speaking as somebody who is totally in support of academic freedom but I'm also concerned about the timing of this resolution and signing on and support of this letter. Only because, as I would say, from the position of CDO most of the complaints that come into my office are about the suppression of academic freedom and are from the other side for those who want to speak against diversity, speak against equity, and speak against our pursuit of systemic racism. My concern is about the practical impact of this resolution. I'm in support of academic freedom, I want to make that very clear, but I'm concerned in this political climate of putting out something like this at this at this time. We do have Time, Place and Manner. We do support academic freedom on campus and so again I'm not saying that we shouldn't support this, I just want people to think carefully about the impact on our entire community and how different parties will interpret the putting out of this statement. I am just concerned

about the timing and how this can be weaponized or used to hurt the very people you're trying to protect.

C: Academic freedom has been abused by any number of people for their own purposes, isn't that what this statement actually says? We need to be prepared to listen to wrongheaded arguments, from time to time, it doesn't mean we're excused from battling those arguments. I will also point out, if it's influential to anyone, that when we debated this resolution, Dr.

Patience Bryant, Director of Black/ African American Equity was sitting with the Professional Standards committee. She endorsed the resolution and told us that if she had a vote, she would vote for it. I do think that there are individuals who are sensitive to these concerns, who nevertheless support a full throated endorsement of academic freedom.

C: I too would like to respond to the CDO and what she shared with us about the attacks on her office. Actually, to me, that demonstrates the importance of us passing this resolution and the Chicago principles. At the same time, if there are specific clauses in the Chicago statement that she thinks are more susceptible to use her words 'being weaponized' then that's definitely something that we can look at. We do not necessarily have to adopt the statement in total, if there are specific concerning clauses in it.

C: As somebody who has been involved with the National Association for Chicana and Chicano Studies, we have been fighting several cases of death threats against several of our faculty who have been videotaped by right wing students. Individuals who have published their families and their children names and who have had very horrible experiences. This makes me believe that this resolution is incredibly important even at the risk of giving anybody the opportunity to say that we need to be fair in our discussion of freedom of expression. I think it is more important to protect those people who are being attacked with this kind of statement. I strongly support this resolution.

C: I am in favor of this resolution, but I wanted to confirm what the CDO, and I also in my office have seen, that freedom of expression can be used as a weapon against the principles that we are ostensibly trying to protect. While I feel like I do not need to remind my fellow senators and colleagues, it's worth saying out loud that part of being in the business of academia, is that we remember that we also need to address the can of worms that we open when we do speak of academic freedom. I would encourage our body to remember that just passing a resolution expressing freedom of expression also entails the work of making sure that we address some of the harm that may come to our students and our communities.

C: I am curious as to why only 81 universities have endorsed this statement since 2014 and I wonder if it speaks to the concerns that the CDO has brought up and whether or not we need to endorse this statement, while maybe instead reviewing our own language and places and making sure we're reinforcing what we have written down that might

more eloquently address what we see as the issues on our campus. I don't know how critical the Chicago statement is to San José State and just curious about how we see it in the context of this larger conversation in US institutions.

C. Organization and Government (O&G):

Senator Sasikumar presented ***AS 1816, Policy Recommendation, Amendment C to University Policy S17-11, Revisions to Organization of the Program Planning Process at SJSU (Final Reading)***. Senator Sasikumar outlined the changes in the Provost's office that lead to inclusion of the new Vice Provost of Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Analytics on this committee, providing a specific seat to the new college of Graduate Studies, and fixing an error of 'or designee' for the Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education. **The Senate voted and AS 1816 passed as written (42-0-2).**

Questions:

Q: Do I read this correctly, that III.B.2 is the designee and not the individual or their designee? Or is the individual already on this committee?

A: The Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education has been serving, that is correct. But when the policy was written the word "or" was inadvertently omitted.

Senator Sasikumar presented ***AS 1811, Policy Recommendation, Amendment B to University Policy S16-8, Selection and Review of Administrators (Final Reading)***. This is a proposal to include staff library staff members on the committee who is going to do the search for the University Library Dean. We also increased the number of faculty librarians because, as per the policy, the committee should have a majority of faculty members on it. This was a policy that was proposed by the University Library Board and the Interim Dean of the Library brought it to us, and so our committee was happy to endorse this and to bring forward this amendment. **The Senate voted and AS 1811 passed as written (41-1-5).**

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

E. Curriculum and Research (C&R):

Senator White presented ***AS 1807, Policy Recommendation, Amendment D to University Policy S14-5, Modification of Guidelines for General Education (GE), American Institutions (AI), and the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) (Final Reading)***. We listened to Senate feedback and what we took from that feedback was we were going to only focus on updating the portions of the GE guidelines that are required by law. The portions of the GE guidelines that are required by law are to get the area F placed into our GE

guidelines. And then, to make the necessary changes to Area D, because of the three units to create Area F. We were asked to consider changing instructor qualifications but because of the lack of time for getting proper feedback we ended up not making any changes to qualifications for these areas. We will take up this issue when the full guidelines are updated in the fall. An amendment was proposed to include another resolved, "That during summer 2021, the Undergraduate Education Office will collaborate with the Chancellor's Office, college associate deans, department chairs, and Executive Committee to determine and implement a curricular solution for programs that would exceed the 120-unit limit because of changes to Areas D and F." This amendment was friendly to the body. An amendment was presented to include "lower-division" in the first whereas clause and to the rationale. This amendment was friendly to the body. **The Senate voted and AS 1807 passed as amended (40-0-4).**

Questions:

Q: With the final resolved clause that your committee worked on, I would like some clarification regarding that clause which permits the Undergraduate Office to implement solutions for high-unit majors. One of those solutions that has been floated, recently, has been the idea of an overlay or double counting the same course, both for the new ethnic studies requirement, as well as for American institutions. This idea is opposed by the Dean of the College of Social Sciences and by every chair in the College of Social Sciences, on the grounds that this would water down the new Ethnic Studies requirement and also water down the criteria for American institutions. Would this final resolved clause permit the imposition of such an overlay over the summer, for example, without returning to the Senate to amend the American Institutions criteria, despite this opposition?

A: It would not allow the Undergraduate Education Office to do that overlay, because it would require that change in the GE guidelines. This resolved clause is going to allow the Undergraduate Education Office to begin working with these programs directly. This would not allow an overlay of AI with Area F.

Q: My original question was about the discussion on double counting and I wanted that to be into the Senate record of whether a cross-listed class in terms of double counting is considered as Area D, two courses from the same discipline. The wording two different disciplines, for a cross-listed class, is it in the same discipline, or is it the home department? The second question, which is just informational is that Chancellor's Office GE exemptions require the action of the systemwide GEAC, which meets May 11. That is the hard deadline for that because the next time GEAC is going to meet will be in September.

A: For cross-listed classes, the way they are treated is whoever the home department for that class is. Even if it's cross listed with another department, the rules would be for the actual home department that created that class. This has to do with the section that says for Area D,

where the students must take any courses in multiple departments. We believe that will still work for our campus because of what we call GE studies on our campus is actually upper-division GE. Our Area S courses are basically upper-division area D, so the students would still be able to meet those criteria of having courses in two different areas.

Q: If we had changes to the guidelines, Area D and Area F when might be the right time to suggest that and make those changes?

A: In this case, because the guidelines are coming forward as an appendix and it's not part of the actual policy recommendation, there would be no more changes to the guidelines at this point. You can make changes to the policy by making changes to the resolved clauses.

Q: Old language needs to be changed. We barely see international students, I don't even know if we have sections for international students, separate from everyone else. We do have students in all our classes who are multilingual speakers, but we don't have special sections with "foreign" students?

A: This is very, very old language and so what we have done for the instructor qualifications is that this language matches the instruction qualifications for all the other GE areas. C&R actually does agree with you that this should be revised. We have tabled this issue to take it up in the fall. I believe the committee is going to strike a lot of this language and work on editing a lot of this language, especially in the instructor qualifications area.

C: I understand the importance of academic degrees in academia as a I have PhD myself, this is in no way denigrating a doctoral degree, but the implication here is that a doctorate makes a person a superior teacher. This is not the case, and when you look at the reality on the ground, the vast majority of GE classes are taught by lecturer faculty. Many of whom do not have a doctorate degree and so to have a requirement like that I think is very insulting and it does faculty a disservice but I will send you the language later Senator White.

C: Thank you to the C&R committee. Special thank you to our Ethnic Studies faculty experts, particularly those on the Area F GRP.

Senator White briefly discussed ***AS 1810, Policy Recommendation, Amendment E to University Policy S14-5, Adopting new Program Learning Outcomes for General Education (First Reading)***. This is a first reading item, but C&R actually passed these outcomes last semester. We did not bring them to the Senate thinking that we would bring the entire GE guidelines to the Senate. The committee is seeking approval from the Senate on these program learning outcomes. They are substantially different from our current learning outcomes. We actually spent the last three years working on these program learning outcomes. There is a nice history behind this. Most of you have also participated in our GE summit, when we reviewed and discussed these, and this is the

culmination of that process. We do not have an assessment plan, yet, because the Committee is all in agreement that before we can develop an assessment plan, we must have a program learning outcomes that we can assess. I can send an email to the Senate and ask you to look at these carefully to give us the feedback that we need, since we are now out of time.

VIII. Special Committee Reports:

Time Certain: 3:30 p.m., University Advancement Update:

Theresa Davis, Vice President, University Advancement, CEO, Tower Foundation

Theresa Davis: With my still not being there on campus, it's great to have an opportunity to see you all and to be able to share with you what is happening in University Advancement. Joining me today is Sabra Diridon, our Interim Associate Vice President for Development and Executive Director of the campaign. She will provide additional support and context as my history with the university is still short.

I want to talk with you about University Advancement and some of the things that have been going on since I came on board July 1 of last year. And, to also talk to you specifically about the campaign. I'm very excited to do that, particularly since some of you have been really involved in our work in planning the campaign. So, one of the things that I realized is that not everyone knows all the units that exist in University Advancement. We have a lot of focus on fundraising, but it's not the only thing that we do. We have Alumni and Community Engagement which is led by Brian Bates, who serves as the Associate Vice President for Alumni and Community Engagement, but also the Executive Director of the Alumni Association. We have Development which is headed by Sabra. We also have Advancement and Campaign Operations which Beth Colbert serves as an Associate Vice President of. We also have the Tower Foundation, led by Danielle LeCesne who joined us December 7th and she came to us from Cal State Fullerton; she served in a very similar role as the Chief Financial Officer there for their foundation. I don't want to be remiss, our Director of Finance Administration is Julie Jimenez and who we could not function well without.

Just a little bit about what each of those four units does. Alumni and Community Engagement, facilitates our ability to develop lifelong support of our alumni and to help them to have the most meaningful campus engagement with San José State. That is, throughout all the phases of their time, I like to think of the students as being alumni in residence. So, from the time that they are students and on the way to becoming lifelong alumni; we're going to have a relationship with them that is meaningful throughout the entire span of their lives.

Development, of course, secures philanthropic funding to help support and fuel the mission and goals of San José State. Our Advancement and Campaign

Operations serves a number of functions, but primarily it is to process all the donations that come to our campus being sure that they are designated appropriately. They develop and manage our gift agreements process, but they also provide technical and analytical support. They provide the backbone infrastructure for the Development team to be able to do that, the prospect research, gift reporting, and development analytics. By development analytics, I mean they look at things like analyzing the pool of prospective donors, who are they, what is their readiness for making the gift. They track our relationship with them through Development officers and even through many of you on campus. They do the reporting out about that, are they having interactions with them that are substantial and they analyze that. As well as the gifts that come to the campus, the way in which they come to the campus and even things like are we ready for the campaign? The Tower Foundation manages the development, investment administration, and banking of all of our philanthropic donations that come to campus.

The funds in which those gifts sit is managed by the Foundation. They are the ones that allow you to have access to your philanthropic funds but we invest the endowment. The endowment sits at about \$181 million. We administer all of the banking functions of the foundation.

Some key updates by unit. The Alumni and Community Engagement team, we are really keen to want to do a better job at. We are doing a fine job, but we could do a much better job at engaging our alumni to ensure their relationship with us in the campus is as good as it could be. We completed a survey in January, February and into March to get a sense of how alumni feel about the campus. We wanted to get a sense of what's important to them and their attitude toward the campus; how they feel about their time as alumni, how they feel about the time when they were students, what do they think about their interactions with us now. We received nearly 2000 responses from that survey, and here are some of the key findings that will help us and inform us is in how we develop programming going forward.

One is they had a desire for enhanced career services, they want to see even more services that we currently offer. They want more information about volunteer opportunities on the campus, this means that they don't want us to just go away, they really want to have this relationship. It's not just one side, they really want to have a voice on campus and be involved. Another finding was that they conveyed statistically significant improvement in the overall opinion that they have of the campus and the decision to attend school here.

We are very excited about a very recent hire. Thank you Brian Bates, who just announced the hire of Dianna Fisher. She is going to be coming on board is our Director of Alumni Engagement to help facilitate this work. Dianna actually was in charge of Alumni Relations at Cal State, Fullerton and is going to be bringing her multiple years, at least two decades of experience in alumni engagement

throughout the various areas of alumni relations, and so we will benefit from having her good work and experience. She starts with us on April 26.

In Development, we are focusing our attention primarily on positioning the infrastructure and practices so that we can have even more robust fundraising activities. The campus goal set for this year was \$25 million. We looked at the fundraising and the philanthropy that came to the campus in the prior two years was on average between \$19 and 21 million. In the years just prior to those two, we were raising about \$30 or 31 million. We want to start to increase that. When we look at the \$350 million dollars that we will be raising for the overall campaign we need an average run rate of about \$50 million. We have quite a ways to go, we think we can get there, but we need to be sure that we're building the infrastructure that will support that goal.

We did to start to build that out this year. The Provost and I, the Deans, and the DODs need to collaborate in a more structured way than we have been in the past. This year we crafted annual development plans for each of the colleges, the library, and athletics as well. Each of the development officers work with their teams, so that we can get a good sense of the fundraising priorities that each of the deans have for their particular colleges and where they really want our time and attention focused. The Provost invited Sabra and I to join the Council of Deans at their meetings every other month, so that we can address fundraising needs. One of the things that the Provost and I feel strongly about is that we don't want to just say to the Deans or even our other campus partners who have fundraising goals, "just go raise the money." We want to be there to help to support. University Advancement in those four units that I talked about, those provide resources to our campus partners as well as those who are involved in the fundraising. The Provost and I want to be partners with the deans, and so our attendance at those meetings of the Council of Deans is to help take a look at how the fundraising is going in the colleges, what we need to address as a group, as opposed to one on one. We do need to have some time for one on one meetings as well, and so the Provost, Sabra and I meet three times a year, at least, with each of the Deans and their DODs to talk specifically about their fundraising. We want to assist with any challenges that they're having and if we're fortunate to have some opportunities that are on the horizon right in front of us, we want to be able to put resources behind leveraging those as well.

It might be useful for you to take a look at what we're calling the Productivity Report. At the very top left hand, you will see this is the annual fundraising goal that was set for the year- that \$25 million. We had not been as a campus really in any consistent way setting a fundraising goal. We know that we need to do that in order to facilitate the work with the campaign and so where to start? What we did was we took a look at 10 year average, the fundraising that has come into each of the academic units, primarily the Colleges and also athletics. This will give us some sense of how the philanthropy has been coming into those particular units plus whatever opportunities that the development officers, team

members in corporate foundation relations, team members who are doing work in planned giving, and what they anticipate will be coming into those units in a given year. From that we devised a goal. Our hope is that, as we're going forward will have will be able to forecast in a way that's even more accurate because we'll have a better sense of what, from the conversations we are having with donors, with foundations, with companies, we will have a clear sense of what to expect to come in, in a given year. At the bottom left is what the goals were for each of the units and what was raised to date. We're happy to say that, with a goal of 25 million, we've been able to sort of just kick past that at \$25.4 million this year. We're not done with the year yet and we certainly aren't resting on our laurels and so there's more fundraising to be done. Just one other update that I wanted to give you concerning the Development team is that we are deeply now into the process of interviewing candidates for the Associate VP of Development. We are moving far along with the interview process with 6 candidates this week, 2 candidates for on-campus interviews.

Some updates for Advancement and Campaign Operations. We're looking at stewardship reimaged. One of the things that came of a feasibility study that was done to assess our readiness for campaign was some feedback from those individuals who said, we think that what's happening there on campus in terms of research and programs are wonderful. They noted excitement about the leadership on campus, but that we don't do a very good job in stewarding our relationships with people who have donated to your campus. We need to examine how is it that we are working with the people who contributed, to give up their time and their financial resources to support what we're doing and how we're developing those relationships. We are reimaging support for stewardship within campus units. Some this stewardship rests with university advancement, but those relationships really live with the people in the colleges and Students Affairs and other places on campus where they're supporting. One of the things that we can do is to help to provide some support so that within the academic units and within student affairs, you're better able to manage those relationships. Our work going forward will be to find some ways to help support those endeavors and then filling vacant positions. Our Director of Donor Relations Veronica Murphy who served in that role for many, many years she retired in December and so we're in process of filling up position.

We look at the Tower foundation, so I mentioned the Danielle LeCesne is our Chief Operating Officer. Danielle joined us on December 7 in fact from Cal State Fullerton where she did similar work. We are really focused in filling vacant positions, that team is down by 50% right now and it's relatively small team to begin with 10 people in total, and to be down by half.

We are assessing policies and procedures, how it is that we do our work in the Tower foundation, so that we can provide a higher level of customer service to our foundation account holders. We need to do a much better job that we're doing right now. One of the things that the team and I talked about when I first

came on board is that those foundation accounts are to the account holders their freedom, you know we are state dollars, can only be used in so many ways, but when you have someone who makes philanthropic gift to a department it gives them the freedom to be able to do some other really cool stuff. We want to be sure that people understand how they can access those funds and we want to be able to provide a customer service in their ability to do that.

We are identifying opportunities to effectuate optimal growth of the endowment. As I mentioned the endowments are at about \$180 million right now. We want the endowment to be able to grow. Of course, it will grow over the course of the campaign as more funds are put into the endowment, more gifts come into the endowment. Then of course positioning the Tower foundation board to help the campus expand its community and alumni partnerships. Individuals on the Foundation board are serving primarily to help us grow philanthropy to the campus and they themselves are well connected in the community. One of the roles that they want to play is to connect us with people who will help the campus to achieve its goals.

While I go through some of the update of this campaign some of you will remember that in October 2019 there was a group of Deans and others on campus who were brought together to start to take a look at what we would even focus a campaign on. There were 17 priorities that came from that discussion, that we thought would really help us move the campus forward in a significant way. The challenge with that is that we came up with about \$644 million worth of campaign priorities and what do we think our capacity was to have a \$644 million campaign? We knew right away that we would need to start to refine. It was in June of last year that the feasibility study results came. Again, there were a number of people for two years who were interviewed just to get a sense of whether or not there would be this support out there for this campaign in the community. The results of that study came back in June, just before I came on board I started July 1st. Then it was in December of last year that we hired the campaign consultants, Bentz, Whaley, and Flessner, to come and help us flesh out a campaign plan and work out what it takes to sort of plan and manage with the campaign.

Here are some of the outcomes. We did set the goal for \$350 million, we would need to bump up our fundraising annually to be about \$50 million a year if we wanted to have that in five years. We're probably going to need to expand that campaign out to seven years minimum in order to meet our campaign goals, because we're going to need to build the relationships and build the plane as it's in flight. The featured campaign priorities that were identified. So, I said feature, because one of the things we looked at was of the 17 priorities, we got them down to about 11 or so. We get within the campaign goal of \$350 million and also be able to focus on those things that we thought would lift the campus to the next level. Those aren't going to be the only things that we're raising money for during the lifetime of the campaign. Every year the Deans will be developing

development plans in which the Dean can say, these are the things that I want the fundraising team to really be focused on over the course of the year. We are into the very early stages of the quiet phase of the campaign and that's where you start to really develop a campaign plan. With the campaign priorities you start to identify who are going to be your lead donors and begin to solicit them. Before you go public with a campaign you've generated 50% to 60% of that goal in commitments, I certainly feel better if we were at 60% of that goal, before we went public with it, but this is where we're starting to identify those individuals who put together what we call a gift pyramid to start to see who we think might be the people to solicit for those goals.

Our partnership with you all really is it at least several ways, there are many more than this, but these are really key primary ways. The refinement of the messaging and communication of those featured priorities are coming from the units. About 64-65% of the priorities live within the colleges or have direct impact on the colleges. Thinking about naming opportunities for the colleges, student scholarships as well, and so that particular bucket is more campus-wide but still has a direct impact on the colleges. Helping us to actually talk about those things what's the real value in those priorities, what's the impact on the campus and, frankly, the community at large. Development training for the deans, department chairs and other campus leaders this fiscal year and throughout the campaign, we are going to help you and developing relationships with donors, how to involved in a productive way in the development process and connecting you with prospective donors. It really is your work that they're excited about, particularly those who aren't new to philanthropy, they give to other institutions, they know that the work of the advancement team is to help them make those connections to help facilitate their philanthropy on the campus and they value it, they respect it.

Questions:

Q: Wonderful informative presentation about Advancement.

A: Thank you very much for your kind words. We are really excited to be doing this work. One of the things that was concerning to me was to hear that with the first campaign there was some sense on the campus that it was University Advancements campaign, or that it was an athletics campaign. University Advancement are a support unit and so the work that we're doing is about the wonderful research and programs that are happening on campus. Our amazing students and faculty, that's what we're raising the funds for, and so I think Sabra would join me in saying that we're really we're excited about bringing the resources to campus that will help you do your job.

Q: Would you be willing to share this presentation with the Senate?

A: Absolutely, be happy to.

Q: Many years ago, as part of a different campaign, there was a push of having faculty and staff directly donating, \$5 a month. Is this a thing or was this part of someone's pet project?

A: We do have a faculty and staff campaign every year and sometimes with competitions among divisions. Funds from \$5 to a million dollars all will count towards our campaign, we do hope to encourage and have robust engagement in that way. If you feel like you can and are able to contribute back to campus but again it's completely voluntary, San Diego State they had really, really amazing robust participation from their faculty and staff during their last campaign and it made a significant difference. It's typically run by our annual fund, and I think that you've seen an email probably from Coleetta a couple of months ago with this, the same message so it's something that will continue to do.

A: [VP Davis] It does tend to be part of any given campaign, you know my thinking about it is this, and this is whether it's for faculty staff, or community members. Philanthropy is about the opportunity to invest in something that you care about, and so, for me, our work in fundraising is really about giving people the opportunity to contribute philanthropically if they if that's something that they care deeply about. It is why it is so important to be sure that we are donor-centric. We take a look at what the campus needs. You don't want to just say that you raised the money. You are bringing in funds for things you only need the money for; taking a look at what the campus needs then sort of know marrying that to a person's interests and things they feel passionate about. To have a faculty and staff fundraising campaign, to make that part of the campaign, whether you're in this formalized structured around campaigns or just annually, it is about giving people the opportunity to support. That is a wonderful thing and it is something we want to continue.

Time Certain: 4:00 p.m., ULB Report to Senate:

Emily Chan, Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship, Martin Luther King Jr. Library

Emily Chan: I am presenting for the ULB today. Joni Bodart, chair of the ULB was unable to present today, so I am presenting in her stead. The last update to this body was on February 10, 2020 and much has happened since the last update.

We wanted to update you on the university library. The last update that was provided to this body was on February 10, 2020 and, as you can imagine, a lot has happened since that last update. The last update really focused an updated presentation on a 2003 presentation that had looked at things like staffing as well as budget. Those numbers don't quite apply, given the unprecedented year that we've had. Today's presentation will really focus on what has happened in the past year.

First, I wanted to give you a quick update on the funding, the libraries operating expenditures. With respect to the library our operating budget for 2020-2021 was

\$298,000, our student assistant budget was \$54,000. It should be noted that our acquisitions budget is separate from the operating budget. At the beginning of the year we were allocated \$2.9 million, and that was the same amount we had been allocated in the year previous. It is important to note that \$1.9 million of that out allocation is from lottery funds. We had received a one-time influx from the first Cares Act, and that was in support of acquisitions.

Let me quickly go over acquisitions and collections. When the library switched over to remote operations, the library recognized that there was a huge need for the materials that would normally have been available through physical course reserves. And, seeing that that was an equity and accessibility issue, the library immediately sought to acquire those titles in electronic format. We examined our physical collection within course reserves and we immediately checked to see if any of that could be acquired electronically. Then using Leganto which is a library technology integration tool within Canvas we were able to facilitate the access of some of those items. The table that you have indicates some of the course reserves expenditures under which we had spent for the past three semesters in spring 2020. We had tried immediately to switch over so much of those collections resulted in expenditure of over \$18,000 for fall 2020, knowing that we would continue to teach in a remote manner and knowing that students would not be able to really come to the library and get course reserves. We were able to again acquire a lot of those materials in electronic format for an expenditure of \$22,000 and for spring we acquired 159 e-books at the expense of \$11,000 so we were really able to use that one-time influx of Cares money not only for this aspect, but to ensure that we could deploy electronic materials for students and teaching and learning needs.

Another aspect that I wanted to bring to the senate's attention was we were able to activate the Hathi trust emergency temporary access services. As our physical collection was something that students and faculty could not access directly, because we're members of the Hathi trust we could activate emergency temporary access. What this does is if there was a digitized version of a physical book in the Hathi trust collection our users could use their SJSU one sign on and access that particular item from home, and so this figure gives you a sense of some of the usage that we had over the past year. You can see that there was a lot of growth and use in this resource. While the physical collections were unavailable we were able to provide access to over 50% of the digitized portion through Hathi trust.

Another aspect that I think is important to note is we increased allocations to acquire course materials to support distance learning so this gives you a sense of some of our expenditures. For electronic books not only in terms of the numbers, but the tremendous usage in terms of our electronic materials. Here you can see that we had gone from 199 e-books in fall 2019 to purchasing 821 e-books during that same time frame a year later. In terms of the usage, it almost doubled and turn away (those are instances where someone tries to access a

book for which we do not have access), that decreased. It is an encouraging sign to see because assuming that the demand is same, that means that we may be meeting some of those needs with our collections.

Some other things that the library did in terms of trying to support remote learning is that we acquired new electronic resources to support teaching, learning, scholarship and research. Amongst some of those resources included JoVE, which is the Journal of Visualized Experiments. A specific module called core biology and this is on top of some of our current modules that we have in support of some of the sciences. Other resources included: the teaching channel which offers information on observations of master teachers, academic video online, films on demand, these were streaming video services. We also acquired various e-book packages in various databases, including Springer and JSTOR. We became a member of the open textbook network, which helps to further adoption of open educational resources.

Some other things that I think are important to note are consortial developments. I spoke about what was happening at SJSU, but there were other things that were happening at the CSU wide level. After many universities moved to remote learning and it was still unclear what the Budget ramifications would be going forward, particularly with fall enrollments, the CSU libraries, they issued a statement to all of the vendors at that point. The CSU was encountering a budget shortfall and we had anticipated a potential cut in terms of acquisitions monies, and so the CSU-wide library deans issued a letter to vendors asking for a 10% reduction and many of our vendors were able to accommodate that, so that's been really helpful. In addition, right now we are in year two of a two-year pilot with Elsevier on being able to publish some of our works in an open access manner. If you are a CSU corresponding author and you are publishing your manuscript in an eligible Elsevier journal title, you can have the option of making your article open access. 14 SJSU faculty have retained their copyright and have made their articles free to read and the Chancellor's Office continues to pursue transformative agreements. This is a pie chart of the uptake across the entire CSU.

In terms of staffing, our student assistant budget was reduced, but the building was closed and some of those public facing positions were not as necessary. We were able to work within our student assistant budget. The hiring chill has affected the library, we had positions that were vacant prior to the hiring chill and we have experienced some turnover in the past year. We were fortunate in having three faculty positions approved and we're currently recruiting for those three positions, a stem librarian, an i-School liaison with an online learning emphasis as well as a scholarly communications and digital scholarship librarian. We also have the library Dean search that is currently underway.

In terms of services, we have been able to really virtualize so many of our services. We were able to virtualize our instruction, reference and research

services, late night tutoring, software, training and support, all of that moved online. We were deploying a lot of those resources and services through our Lib chat and Zoom integrations platforms. In 2019 we had 2092, chats in 2020 that jumped up to 7452 and we're on target for not only meeting this number but surpassing it. If you haven't seen our chat if you go to our website, you go to the One Search catalog. As soon as you're on that page for more than 45 seconds, the chat widget appears and asks you if you need any help and we've seen that that is a really nice element for all of our users.

In addition, we've launched King Bot, which is an artificial intelligence BOT that can answer questions outside of our staff hours. Interlibrary loan is still available. However, we are only fulfilling electronic requests for articles and book chapters at this point. We do anticipate resuming physical IRL in August. Other things that we were able to virtualize were events and exhibits and that's a list of some of the amazing things that we were able to continue to provide in an online manner.

We were able to distribute technology, prototyping materials, CSU plus, and SJSU holds materials through our locker service. That locker service did help us to distribute materials in a safe manner and meet the quarantine requirements at the time. We were also able to fulfill faculty's RSCA requests during December through February 2021 when things kind of shut down again. We were able to ship materials to faculty directly. All 16 requests that we received, you know all of those faculty members were contacted and those materials were acquired.

Some new developments that you might not be aware of. There was an NEH challenge grant that the library collaborated with the College of Humanities and the Arts. We were successful in being awarded that grant. This will help to create a Digital Humanities Center. It is a five year project with a \$375,000 grant with matching funds.

Questions:

Q: Thank you for the chat. That has been an amazing support during this whole pandemic, but I did want to know about the open access. Typically open access articles do have faculty supporting it with fees and I was wondering what is happening with the Elsevier publications?

A: Great question. During this time period, all of those article publishing charges (APCs) that would normally go to the faculty member to pay if they wanted to opt for open access those are all being waived. During this time period, anyone who submits to an eligible Elsevier title will have those APCs waived as long as you submit during the calendar year. It doesn't matter when it's accepted or anything like that, as long as you submit during this calendar year.

The peer review process takes varying time periods, depending on the publication. Once it's accepted, you will get the ability to opt into this pilot and as a result of opting in, your article processing charge would be waived. That is typically about a \$3,000 value. So when I went to that slide, at that point 218

articles had been made open access, if you multiply that by like the \$3,000 charge that each article would be valued at, that is a value of \$654,000 to the CSU. So, it's completely free for this pilot period and we're hoping that the Chancellor's Office will continue to pursue these types of transformative agreements. Instead of us paying necessarily for reading rights. We're hoping to use more of our dollars towards allocating them towards publishing rights. And that's what the UC has done recently with Elsevier.

Q: I had a question regarding e-books has there been any thoughts or conversations about multi-access e-books for students?

A: In terms of whenever we acquire e-books, we always try to acquire the concurrency type that is unlimited. If it's available, we try to acquire the unlimited user model for a particular title. If that isn't available for a particular title, then that's when we would look at like three users or one user, but we typically try to get unlimited whenever possible. If you are seeing only a few users that can use a particular title, that's generally a constraint that's placed on that title by the publisher itself. That isn't to say we couldn't try to purchase multiple, like three user licenses, and if that's the case, then I think that's a conversation to have with the liaison librarian. But we generally try to get unlimited access models.

IX. New Business: None

X. State of the University Announcements:

A. Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA):

B. Chief Diversity Officer:

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

D. Statewide Academic Senators:

E. Provost:

F. Associated Students President:

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

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