

2021-2022 Academic Senate Minutes
April 18, 2022

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

Ex Officio: Present: Van Selst, Curry, Rodan, Kaur Absent: None	CHHS Representatives: Present: Sen, Smith, Schultz-Krohn, Baur Absent: None
Administrative Representatives: Present: Perez, Wong(Lau), Faas, Day, Del Casino Absent: None	COB Representatives: Present: Rao, Tian Absent: None
Deans / AVPs: Present: Ehrman, d’Alarcao, Shillington, Lattimer Absent: None	COED Representatives: Present: Mathur, Muñoz-Muñoz Absent: None
Students: Present: Chuang, Cramer, Kumar Sandoval-Rios, Allen, Walker Absent: None	ENGR Representatives: Present: Saldamli, Kao Absent: None
Alumni Representative: Absent: Walters	H&A Representatives: Present: Khan, Frazier, Riley, Han, Massey, Kataoka Absent: None
Emeritus Representative: Present: Jochim	COS Representatives: Present: French, White, Switz, Andreopoulos Absent: None
Honorary Representative: Present: Peter, Lessow-Hurley, Buzanski Absent: None	COSS Representatives: Present: Hart, Sasikumar, Wilson, Raman, Haverfield Absent: None
General Unit Representatives: Present: Monday, Yang, Higgins, Masegian, Lee Absent: None	

II. Land Acknowledgement: Senator Switz presented the land acknowledgment. The land acknowledgment 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.

III. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–
 The Senate Minutes of March 21, 2022 were approved as amended (40-0-2).

IV. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Acting Chair Sasikumar announced that former Senator and Librarian Paul Kauppila passed away earlier this month. The Senate took a few moments of silence in remembrance of Senator Kauppila.

Acting Chair Sasikumar announced that Interim President Perez has signed all policies submitted to him since his arrival.

Acting Chair Sasikumar announced that Administrative Professionals Day is April 27, 2022. She encouraged Senators to acknowledge their Administrative staff on April 27, 2022.

B. From the President:

Interim President Perez commended the Academic Senate on the most recent policies passed by the Senate that are very impactful policies and he is very impressed with the Senate for taking on these policy topics. The discussions in the Senate have been very productive.

From the end of April through the end of May is normally a very fun time of the year with the Commencement, Celebration of Research, faculty and staff service awards, the Honoring Heroes event at the library, etc. However, it is also a very stressful time of year so be kind to each other. Also, if you have students that need assistance, please refer them to SJSU Cares or CAPS to support them. We have lots of services out there for them.

Last week you saw an email from the Interim President stating that the mask mandate will continue through the end of the year. The president is proud of the fact that we continue to take each other's well being into consideration. Continuing the mask mandate maximizes our ability to have an in-person commencement, which the president is very much looking forward to this event.

The CSU system has named a new Interim Chancellor, Dr. Jolene Koester. She will start in early May. The interim president met her a couple of times at Sacramento State. The Interim President's and Interim Chancellor's time at Sacramento State University never overlapped, but they knew of each other. Everyone that the interim president has met that knows Interim Chancellor Koester, speaks very highly of her.

We had our WASC visit. The team came and stayed a few days. The president thanked everyone that was involved. They had 30 separate meetings including the open forum. WASC provided both commendations and recommendations after the numerous meetings. We will get the recommendations from WASC in a few weeks and we will then have the opportunity to make factual corrections. The team will then take that into

consideration before making a final report to WASC at which time we will have the opportunity to respond to the report and then, somewhere around the early 20's of June, the WASC board will meet, and we will be able to hear the final report from WASC. The president anticipates that the result will be relatively good. There was nothing in the exit session by the WASC team that really surprised or shocked the president. They also said a lot of good things about us. The president is a fan of audits and assessments. This process brings those from outside the institution to provide input on how to improve and do a better job, We will learn from this.

V. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

Executive Committee Minutes of March 7, 2022 – No questions.
Executive Committee Minutes of March 14, 2022 – No questions.
Executive Committee Minutes of April 4, 2022 – No questions.

B. Consent Calendar:

There was no dissent to the Senate Consent Calendar of April 18, 2022.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

VI. Unfinished Business:

Senator Frazier presented ***AS 1830, Policy Recommendation, Emergency Short Term Loans for Students (Final Reading)***. Senator Khan presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to strike line 34.

Senator Van Selst presented a motion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes to finish the unfinished business. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted ant the motion passed (29-4-3). **The Senate voted and AS 1830 passed as amended (30-4-1).**

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

Senator Mathur presented a motion to suspend Standing Rule VII in order to adjust the agenda to allow ***AS 1833, Policy Recommendation, Amendment H to University Policy S15-8, Retention, Tenure, Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and Standards: to include within the category of Academic Assignment, activities and specifically enhance inclusion, educational equity, and achievement in the surrounding and broader communities (First Reading)*** to be taken out of order as the first item under the Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the motion passed (36-0-5).

A. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

Senator Schultz-Krohn presented ***AS 1833, Policy Recommendation, AS 1833, Policy Recommendation, Amendment H to University Policy***

S15-8, Retention, Tenure, Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and Standards: to include within the category of Academic Assignment, activities and specifically enhance inclusion, educational equity, and achievement in the surrounding and broader communities (First Reading).

PS looked very closely at the Sense of the Senate Resolution that was passed last spring SS-S21-2. It called for PS to modify all three RTP categories to specifically address inclusion, educational equity, and achievement. The category of academic assignment has been modified to recognize that faculty may have an academic assignment that includes additional responsibilities beyond teaching and PS provided examples such as working with diverse students, recruitment efforts, providing specific academic support for students, and academic assignments that includes academic responsibilities to the chairperson, supervisor, or coordinator. PS is not trying to change the categories of S15-8. They are just trying to make the academic assignment category broader to recognize the diversity of academic assignments of the SJSU faculty.

Questions:

Q: I would like to propose moving line 107 through line 112.

A: Point of order, this is not a final reading so it is time for questions only. Please send your comments to the committee.

Q: I would suggest PS take a look at University policy F12-6, which is the teaching evaluation policy. It gives cautionary language about SOTEs and you want to make sure the new language you are using in the RTP policy is in agreement with the teaching evaluation policy. For example, the teaching evaluation policy talks about the need to train everyone using the SOTE guide because of potential bias, and so forth and so on. Comparing the two policies might be helpful to you.

Secondly, in the descriptors for Academic Assignment going from baseline to good, it seemed to me as if there is some repeated language. Any information that appears in baseline is already included in the criteria for good. You may want to reexamine the progression between baseline and good. My final suggestion is to think very carefully about the instructions the policy gives about dividing academic assignment from service. If you are going to make it possible that the faculty member can decide which bucket each item goes into, then you need to make it clear who gets to choose. Otherwise the committee reviewing the dossier could say, "No, we think it belongs under this other category."

A: Thank you so much. Those suggestions are very helpful.

Q: Regarding the norming of the SOTEs on lines 126-131. Has PS consulted with SERB on the norms. The norming rates have greatly

increased. I think they have went from 4.2 to 5.3 meaning that a faculty member cannot receive above the norm, which is a criteria for excellence. Would PS consider, since the norms are so high, not putting them in the baseline, or at least consulting with SERB on this?

A: Yes, we are looking at that. One of the things we are trying to address is that there is diversity within the norms if you are talking about 1 standard deviation or 2 standard deviations from the mean. We were trying to diminish the reliance singularly on norming data and taking a more holistic approach.

Q: Has PS discussed the possibility of relying solely on the narrative SOTEs and discontinuing the use of numerical ratings entirely?

A: The committee looked at SOTEs being used from a holistic perspective. Eliminating the numeric SOTEs is not something we were looking at. We were trying to elevate the use of the narrative aspect of the SOTEs. We were looking at the courses and, particularly, the demands of the course. There are courses that are going to be high stakes, and then there are other courses that faculty may find themselves with different teaching experiences. This would be something we have not looked at as wholesale elimination of the numeric portion of the SOTES. We can look holistically at all of it, not just taking one portion over the other.

C: One other thing PS did discuss and change was University Norm Range to Norm Ranges, because we know there are department norm ranges, college norm ranges, and some departments may be teaching a particularly difficult class and the department norm ranges may be low. Maybe we need to tweak this a little to give departments flexibility in articulating which norm ranges are most relevant to their dossier.

C: I think our SOTEs should be categorized between tenure/tenure-track and lecturer. I think our ratio right now captures 60% lecturer and 40% tenure/tenure track. Breaking that data down could be really useful.

Q: Have you looked at any data with regard to the percentage of students who provide SOTEs out of the total number of students in a given class, and having done that, how did that inform your decisions to make changes in the policy?

A: Although we don't have the actual SOTE data to know how many are submitted, there were several of us on PS that have served on various RTP Committees. Part of PS concern was that based on the periodic SERB reports, there is a tendency to take a single data point and base it on that. We wanted this amendment to highlight that there should be that ballistic vantage point that includes not only the numeric data, but also looks deeply into the narrative. The other thing that is also part of the RTP training, is that when there is a low response rate that needs to be one of the contextualized things that needs to be considered; looking at that data whether it is the numerical or narrative data.

C: While looking for one kind of balance, you may be creating another kind of imbalance, which is that you are asking folks to take a closer look at narrative evaluations and it may be the case that those represent a very small percentage of the students in a class.

A: Our point was just to try to avoid having just the single SOTE item 13 used, but to look more holistically at the data that is available.

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

C. University Library Board (ULB):

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

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

VIII. Special Committee Reports:

Athletics Board Report for 2021-2022 presented by Professor Annette Nellen, Chair of the Athletics Board, Tamar Semerjian, Faculty Athletics Representative, Shonda Goward, AVP for UG Advising and Success, Jeff Konya, Director of Athletics, Kristan Kelly, Director of Compliance, Time Certain: 4:00 p.m.

Annette Nellen: The purpose of the Athletics Board as stated in the policy, F07-2 and modifications to it, is to be a sounding board. We are required to make an annual report to the Senate. We report to both the President and the Academic Senate. It is a special board. It does not have a representative from every college, but does have a majority of faculty as members with the Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) as a member. There are two students including the AS President or their designee and the Chair of the Student Athletic Committee (SAC), an athlete, as required by the NCAA. A lot of time is spent at meetings asking questions so we can better understand the operation of athletics.

Jeff Konya (Athletics Director): [A video was presented remotely from Palm Springs, CA by Jeff Konya] After consulting with our students, the AS Board has come up with a new vision for athletics. It is replicated in the video. It preaches cutting edge experience with student athletes and building championship in the classroom, in competition, and in the community. Embedded in that vision are several different considerations and one of them is a strong commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion and social and racial change. We hired our first-time day-to-day individual to look after those important considerations and we brought speakers in to speak to those particular items. We have as part of all our hiring an increased emphasis on diversity and inclusion. As far as Title IX updates, gender equity will be very prominent in terms of what we are trying to build. In terms of the Department of Justice (DOJ), we have ramped up our policies with respect to well-being attendant policies, sometimes referred to as the “chaperone” policies. All of our coaches and staff go through Title IX training.

We have also increased the ability of our student athletes to report issues in real time for an immediate response. They can remain anonymous. The report will immediately go to an administrator so we can figure out where these issues are coming from. As far as other aspects, amplification of the Spartan brand is very important to us. This is a strong marketing consideration for the university and intercollegiate athletics. Our Spartan brand relationship extends into NBC Bay Area in terms of real SJSU student athletes, their life stories, and academic successes. Our first broadcast was well received and had great viewership. We have also tried to emphasize the Spartan brand in social media. We've doubled some of our followers in social media. We are very cognizant of what is going on around us especially with the NCAA. There was a vote in January in terms of the NCAA trying to establish new governance and set of rules regarding how to conduct business in Division I. In essence it unbundled Division I, II, and III. Kristan Kelly will give an update in her comments on what the transformation committee is doing in trying to set the stage for what Division I could ultimately look like from a governance perspective. Some of you may know the buzz word, "name, image and likeness" that has come into the intercollegiate athletic space circa summer 2021. The NCAA allows student athletes to profit from the name, image, and likeness legislation. California is number one in law that allows student athletes to profit from their name, image, and likeness in rhythm with the intent of the NCAA. In consideration for those perspectives, SJSU worked with open door policies to establish our name, image, and likeness policies for our student athletes.

Kristan Kelly:

What you see on your screen are the 2020/2021 and 2021/2022 APR numbers. There will be no public release this year. The NCAA is planning on possibly going back to a public release next spring. So, what is APR? Academic Progress Rate (APR) is where the NCAA measures your academic success. It is based on four semesters where you get is two points for each student athlete that is receiving athletic aid. What they are looking at is one point each semester if you are academically eligible and then you get another point if you are a full-time student athlete. There are some exceptions if you are in your final semester before graduation, or if you graduate. If you notice in the numbers, we went up in 12 points in sports from the 2020/2021 year to the 2021/2022 year. We stayed the same in four sports. We dipped in four sports, but nothing was more than a four-point dip. Some of the things we want you to know, and I want to thank the Provost and Shonda Goward, the SAS team right now is making a shift. We've been doing some really incredible work with them. The one thing we are going to start doing is using the colleges to advise student athletes. This is really cool for us. We are hoping it is going to be two-fold by giving our student athletes the best opportunity to have that advising and allow students to be engaged with faculty. Then from an NCAA perspective, in the past for anyone that transferred, in order for us to get that adjustment they had to leave with a 2-6. NCAA has recognized that the 2-6 is a little off especially if student athletes were able to leave and use their one-time transfer. In August 2021, the NCAA took that

requirement off. Now if you leave an institution and you meet those regular progress sports rules, they are going to give you the adjustment anyway. We are making changes and we are expecting things to get better and better, especially with our partnership with Shonda Goward, her staff, and ongoing training.

The next subject I'll cover is the transformation committee. Just last week we met and tabled all the 2021/2022 legislation and they put a moratorium on any legislation for the 2022/2023 academic year. What they are saying is that they recognize the importance of the work of the transformation committee. It is going to make changes to legislation and they want the committee to really focus on what they are doing. There are five key elements that the transformation committee is charged with. The committee is focusing on three this year and they are student athlete experience, regulatory structure, and the impact of direct financial support for students. What does that look like? They are saying that when it comes to rules they keep academics at the forefront, but at the same time they are looking at things that really impact the student athlete especially in the 21st century. They are looking at things that will impact their ability to pursue professional endeavors. They are also looking at the transfer portal and how to make it more streamlined. Finally, they are looking at the infractions process. They want this to be a more streamlined, time-sensitive process, and the penalties need to fit what the violation is. They are also looking at financial benefits and how can we allow student athletes to benefit in this new world. As a transformation committee, SJSU has put a moratorium on legislation to let the committee focus on these areas. Next week the transformation committee will have another zoom meeting.

Tamar Semerjian:

Thank you for having me. I'm chair of the Kinesiology Department, but here today as the university's FAR. There have been significant changes in the athletics leadership and it has been a joy to work with them. I began the year developing several goals with the President's Office and I wanted to highlight those. One of the goals was to conduct a cluster analysis for majors with an eye toward any differential patterns towards gender and race. I'm hoping to have that analysis available by Fall 2022. The second goal was to have the Athletics Board consulted on competition and class schedules. We needed to have a conversation on how schedules might impact academic success. We also setup exit interviews for student athletes that are either graduating or going to other institutions. We have also submitted a referral to the Organization and Government Committee regarding the Athletics Board and the FAR policy. We look forward to working with the Senate on this policy. The final goal was to strengthen communication between the student athletes, athletics, and the FAR. We have had several meetings and have now setup regular meeting schedules with the FAR and athletics. The FAR is also working with a former student athlete, Dr. Hannah, to encourage student athletes to pursue a stem field in their baccalaureate work.

Questions:

Q: Can you give us an accounting of concussions at SJSU? Your predecessor gave us a previous report and promised annual reports we could compare to.

A: [Nellen] Because of the limited time to report today, we didn't include this. However, we can provide a report, or come and give a report to the Senate in the Fall. We have an independent doctor not affiliated with SJSU that does the report. [Konya] We will get the data for this group. There have been a lot of advances in this area over the last several years including advanced football helmets that are starting to reduce the number of concussions from a national perspective.

Q: The numbers in the APR were mostly between 900 to 1,000. How do the numbers for 2021/2022 and 2020/2021 compare to the pre-pandemic years?

A: That is a good question. These numbers are better than the pre-pandemic years, especially in men's sports. There was one sport that had a particularly low number and we are making progress in that sport now as well. The APR measures eligibility and retention predominantly. We also have a Graduate Success Rate (GSR) which is a compilation of a cohort in real time predictive of graduation success of the current student athlete population. And, we also have a Federal Graduation Rate (FSR) that we report to the government. These numbers compare the student athlete graduates to the overall university graduates. The most current rate that we can give you is the APR, because that is a track of the current population within the student athlete portfolio.

Q: There were two requirements that the DOJ made and one was that student athletes were to be surveyed on their knowledge of Title IX requirements. Another requirement was that a meeting take place every semester between the SAC, the Title IX Coordinator, and the Athletics Director. Can you provide a quick status on meeting these requirements?

A: We are in the process of fulfilling that last requirement. We had a Fall meeting with our new Title IX Coordinator (Skip Bishop), myself, and the SAC. We have another meeting setup for early May. We will then record that and put it into the DOJ compliance report. In terms of the Title IX knowledge base, we did have an outside group come in to assist with this. We've had different presentations depending on the audience. We've had student presentations and also staff presentations and analysis. It has been followed-up on with our student athlete's medical team, which is led by Laura Alexander. She will also be doing the concussion report. Laura is responsible for making sure we are in compliance with those regulations.

Q: I have some questions, maybe for next year. I'm particularly interested in how the academic challenges play out and hope you are tracking these changes and how our student athletes respond to different advising methods. They seem to run a little counterintuitive to what our students expressed before about what they prefer for academic advising, particularly around advising for student athletes. You also mentioned hiring somebody for athletics to focus on

[Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion] DEI work. I would be interested in seeing what initiatives are started and how they work out next year.

A: We are going to post what we are trying to achieve to the public and we can certainly include that document as well.

Q: I'm also interested in seeing the work on student financial support and helping student athletes see what their options are.

A: [Nellen] Thanks for the questions. Many things that the NCAA requires are really quite helpful to the students and the student athletes tend to have a higher graduation rate and speed. Student athletes also get very involved in talking to high school and junior high school students as far as being involved with the community. As far as financial aid, all our students need better knowledge. I've made notes on the reports you are looking for.

Shonda Goward:

The SAC team still exists. They are primarily focused on academic support and eligibility. We have shifted advising into the college, because they are the experts on updated curriculum and policy. We want student athletes to have the same experience as everyone else and also get the most updated information on what the curriculum is for their particular major. We also want them to interact with faculty. We also want them to meet people in their area outside of athletics. We don't want athletes that don't remain with their team to feel disconnected from their college and those are some of the reasons that we have shifted advising to the colleges. [Nellen] We want to make sure the student athlete is getting the same information from their college that every other student is getting. We think this is quite valuable.

IX. New Business:

Election of Two Faculty Members to the Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President (ACTCSP), **Time Certain: 2:30 p.m.**

Acting Chair Sasikumar announced that only the faculty could vote in this election. Senator Peter explained that the reason only the faculty were voting is that the other groups (staff, students, etc.) are holding their own elections for representatives to the committee. The nominees were: Monica Allen, Kathryn Blackmer-Reyes, Nancy DaSilva, Stefan Frazier, Mahendra Nidhi, Brandon White, and Hiu-Yung Wong. The candidates presented their statements of interest. **The Senate voted and Senator Frazier received a majority of the votes and was elected.** The nominee that received the lowest vote count was dropped. The Senate followed this procedure and voted six additional times until a majority vote was received. **Nidhi Mahendra was elected as the second faculty member to the committee with a majority of the votes.**

X. State of the University Announcements:

A. Associated Students President (AS): Moved to the next meeting.

- B. Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF):** Moved to the next meeting.
 - C. Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA):** Moved to the next meeting.
 - D. Chief Diversity Officer:** Moved to the next meeting.
 - E. CSU Faculty Trustee:** Moved to the next meeting.
 - F. Statewide Academic Senators:** Moved to the next meeting.
 - G. Provost:** Moved to the next meeting.
- XI. Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.