

**Executive Committee Minutes**  
**November 15, 2021**  
**via Zoom, 12:00 to 1:00 p.m.**

Present: Alison McKee (Chair), Anoop Kaur, Brandon White, Julia Curry, Karthika Sasikumar, Kimb Massey, Laura Sullivan-Green, Ravisha Mathur, Vincent Del Casino (12:15 p.m.), Winifred Schultz-Krohn, Charlie Faas, Patrick Day, Tabitha Hart, Kathleen Wong(Lau)

Absent: Mary Papazian

Guests: Theresa Davis, Beth Colbert

1. The Executive Committee approved the consent agenda (Executive Committee Agenda of November 15, 2021, Consent Calendar of November 15, 2021 as amended by AVC Massey, Executive Committee Minutes of October 4, October 18, and November 8, 2021) (14-0-0).
2. Vice President of University Advancement, Theresa Davis, and AVP of Advancement and Campaign Operations, Beth Colbert, presented proposed members for the Honorary Degree Committee. Each year every CSU campus is asked to present names to the Chancellor's Office to receive the honorary doctoral degree. The purpose of this committee is to review those names recommended from our campus and make recommendations to the president. The president must then submit her nominations to the Chancellor's Office by December 3, 2021. The Chancellor's Office will then review and select recipients at their meeting in January 2022.

Questions:

Q: How were the proposed honorary doctoral nominees selected?

A: The nominees are recommended in a number of different ways. To begin with there is always a list of nominees leftover from previous years. Two of the nominees on this year's list were left over from previous nominees. Also, some nominees came to us as recommendations from the Board of Trustees.

Q: If a degree is being awarded such as from the Communications Studies Department, to what extent does that department have input into that award?

A: One of the things we try to do is have a method in which we identify people. We took a look at the people that were recommended for the award and we hope that the recommended committee members before you are representative of those people and fields.

C: [VP Day] We live in an age where this is tricky business. I would suggest considering a way to have CDO Kathy Wong(Lau) take a look at the makeup of the potential committee members with an eye towards diversity and equity. This is just a recommendation.

A: I recommend that the committee find a way of including Kathy's perspective on diversity, equity, and inclusion. [McKee] When Theresa and I were meeting I asked her what policy she was following and how the names came up. We do not have a university policy governing who we might recommend to be on the committee. I checked and some CSU's have a policy and some don't. This is something we might want to consider in the future.

C: [Past Chair Mathur] I sat on this committee when I was Vice Chair of the Senate. When we got the recommended nominee names, we did our due diligence in researching them to see if there was anything in their background that could potentially reflect badly on SJSU and to ensure that they represented the values and the mission of the university. So, there is some investigative work that is done around each nominee, but I also hear VP Day's point. We should think about our diversity initiatives and who would best represent our university; faculty, staff and students.

[Beth Colbert] I had my research team put together a background document on the nominees that we are putting forward for consideration, specifically looking for any kind of a red flag or something in their background that could dissuade us from wanting to give them an honorary degree. Theresa and I have been having conversations about putting a specific process in place. There have been occasions that we have been given only two days to prepare nominations for the chancellor's office. We want to be out in front of it. We have a running list of people nominated by the colleges throughout the year and we go through it and look at who rises to the level where an honorary degree would be warranted and those are the names we put forward. We do have an eye on diversity such as in ensuring women and people of color are represented. We are happy to entertain nominees so if faculty have alumni that are distinguished in their career send me an email and we will add them to the list.

[VP Day] We should probably shore up how this list gets developed going forward. What Kathy provides us is the nuance of how things are shifting and how things move over time around these kinds of conversations. That is why I think Kathy can track that lens as to where things are going. I just wanted to make this clear as to why I was recommending Kathy Wong(Lau).

A: Thank you for that VP Day.

C: [CDO Wong(Lau)] I see a noticeable absence of anyone that is Latinx or someone that could look at those candidates for the honorary degree. If we are going to add people, we should look at that.

Q: Do you have a recommendation for someone to fill that role?

A: [CDO Wong(Lau)] CDO Wong(Lau) made several recommendations. The committee discussed and selected one of the recommendations to represent Latinx.

C: VP Davis announced that if there were no objections to the list as amended, she would be forwarding it to the president. There were no objections.

3. The Executive Committee discussed two nominees for one seat on the Athletics Board. The committee selected a nominee to recommend to the president (14-0-0).
4. The Executive Committee discussed the University Governance Awards and the President's Governance Award. The president's office contacted the Senate Administrator and asked for finalist recommendations for the President's Governance Award. The Senate Administrator provided the Executive Committee with a list of the students that were granted the University Governance Award for 2020-2021. Students are eligible for the University Governance Award if they have attended 80% of the meetings of either the Senate, a Senate Committee, the AS Board of Directors, or other AS Committee and are recommended by the committee chair. The Senate Administrator then submits student awardees to the Registrar's Office to have their transcript annotated with the award each year.

The President's University Governance Award does not have specific criteria and/or procedures for the award. The Executive Committee did not feel they could make a recommendation for the award to the president without further information about the students to make a selection. A suggestion was made that statements be collected from the students about what they had learned while serving on their committees along with recommendations from the committee chairs next year. The Executive Committee discussed procedures and it was felt that this should be handled out of the President's Office since the President selects the award winner for the year. Chair McKee will inform the president's office that the Executive Committee was not comfortable recommending finalists at this time. A further suggestion was made by Past Chair Mathur that the President's Office make a referral to the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee to review the policy on the President's Governance Award and add criteria and procedures.

5. Updates from the Policy Committees:
  - a. **From the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):**  
I&SA will be discussing who will chair I&SA during the spring while Chair Sullivan-Green is on sabbatical. I&SA will also be working on a resolution on student absences for the Senate meeting in December and a referral regarding the add and drop deadlines. We also have some subcommittee work going on addressing the educational equity policy that is 30 years old.

Q: Can you elaborate a bit on the add/drop deadline referral?

A: There are two referrals both requesting extending the add/drop deadline, but the extent of the extension is a little different from the administration and student sides. I&SA is trying to decide what makes sense both to maximize opportunity for students, but also to manage what we need to manage for SJSU. We had some information from other CSUs about their deadlines. We tend to land in the middle of the CSU campuses.

**b. From the Professional Standards Committee (PS):**

The PS Committee is still working on amendments to the Retention-Tenure-Promotion (RTP) policy, particularly looking at the service section with an eye on educational equity and inclusion. In addition, we are looking at having amendments to both the Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA) and academic assignment areas early in 2022.

PS is working with Maggie Barrera on creating a website that will contain all the information for departments that want to generate their own RTP guidelines. Right now it's a bit like being on a treasure hunt. We are trying to get this in a one-stop-shop where departments can get all the information they need to first of all make a decision on whether or not they need department guidelines and then provide direction on how to construct them. Chair Schultz-Krohn has been meeting with the chairs, the Faculty Diversity Committee, and the Student Evaluation Review Board (SERB) on some of the issues with an eye toward educational equity and reform.

PS is also looking at the department guidelines as they come through and trying to offer suggestions and support.

**c. From the Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):**

C&R is working on three policies to bring to the Senate by the end of the semester. One of these policy amendments is to the General Education (GE) Guidelines. That will probably go out campus-wide for faculty to provide input to their faculty Senators and then we will bring that forward. We will then have a first reading of a new policy that will rescind University policy S05-13, which has to do with Organized Research and Training Units (ORTU). We have been out of compliance with the chancellor's office guidelines for some time now. One of the last things Pam Stacks did before she retired was to work on this policy. There are significant changes to the ORTU policy and we have been slowly going through it. We will be bringing it to the Senate for a first reading to get feedback. We will also be bringing back the Curricular Accessibility policy. We brought this forward once before as a first reading. We are unsure if we will bring this back as another first reading or a final reading yet. We will be discussing that today.

Questions:

Q: If the GE Guidelines are approved would they be coming into play in 2022? If they are not approved, does that mean they will not be applied in the Fall 2022 and the earliest they could be applied is Spring of 2023?

A: The major changes were to areas C and F. As far as these new guidelines go, the recommendation from C&R is that the courses would only go through the new GE Guidelines when they go up for their review. Right now all GE courses are coupled with their program plan, so in essence anyone submitting a program plan in Fall 2022 would have to make changes

to their GE classes to show they are being brought into alignment with the current GE Guidelines.

Q: This question is about AB 928 that has been signed into law. Do you know anything about what the timeline for implementation is and how that process is going to go? Has C&R talked about that and how that might affect our GE Guidelines, because I know there is going to be some debate around Area E?

A: C&R will be discussing this today. The last time we discussed this, the Provost and I were waiting to see what the UC's were going to do about this. Curriculum chairs across the CSU have no idea either. As far as the timeline goes, I can provide that information. The bill states that a committee will be formed and the committee makeup will have members from the community colleges, the CSU, and the UC. They basically have until May 2023 to implement whatever the recommended changes will be. That is essentially 1 ½ years to implement the changes at the campus level. If the committee cannot reach an agreement by then, then it goes to the administration across the systems to come to an agreement by December 2023. This still gives all the campuses one year to come up with all their own internal policies on how to implement this. That is all we have to go on right now. The reality is that when you look at the differences between the CSU and the UC campuses, there are five units. However, when you look closely those five units are world communications and Area D. The UC does not have those two. There are some nuances though. For example, it is unclear how Area F is going to fit into this. The UCs are currently working on adopting Area F, but they are going to allow overlay with Area C and D. My opinion is that this presents a problem for the community colleges. The other big piece of the puzzle is American Institutions. The UCs don't require American Institutions, but we do. This is complex. Once the committee is formed they are going to task all the campuses with beginning to gather information. That is what we will probably be doing next.

C: I don't want to wait for the UCs, because then the UCs will drive the conversation.

A: The conversation will be driven by the committee and we don't know who is going to be put on the committee. It just has representation from the three different groups.

C: [Chair McKee] There is a Senate Chairs' meeting this week and I'm going to keep my eye on that. This has been an ongoing conversation in the meetings. I agree that we don't want to wait for anyone else to drive the conversation.

A: The question is whether the UCs are going to increase the number of units in their general education. That will be the big driver. It will be the committee that speaks to all the groups and bodies.

C: [Provost] Just to be clear, I believe the board has pushed at the California state level for a reduction of the general education program in the past, so the

Chancellor's Office backing AB 928 could mean that the UCs aren't the only ones driving a UC-like pattern, because it would mean a reduction in the general education program in the California state system.

Q: Are you getting any sense that we are being told to plan for certain changes to Area F?

A: As far as I know, mums the word for everything right now. It is pure speculation at this point.

Q: We'll follow-up on that one.

6. Updates from the University:

**a. From the Chief Diversity Officer (CDO):**

The Campus Committee on Diversity Equity and Inclusion (CCDEI) report is live and on the website right now. It is on the agenda for our cabinet meeting on December 2, 2021. We are producing a rubric for the committee. We will meet this Friday and then every two weeks and will track these issues. A number of the items in the report have already been undertaken or are under way.

Certainly there are things on there that need long-term addressing. The report goes live today. The CCDEI continues to work on this project. We have had various groups come in such as representatives from the Black and African-American community as well as representatives from the Black Spartan Advisory Group, and the Black Faculty and Staff Association to present some of their key issues and priorities. This week the Gathering of Academic Indigenous and Native Americans (GAIN) will be visiting the CCDEI and sharing priorities. Part of the work we are doing this year is trying to get literacy up for everybody and get an in-depth nuance and understanding of some of the issues of each group. However, subcommittees are still broken down into the key sub areas of students, faculty, and staff as well as other community groups.

I'm putting a You Tube link for some comments from the Chairwoman of the Muwekma-Ohlone Tribe in the chat. I think all the Executive Committee should review this. When we are reading the land acknowledgement, this will give you the context to understand why some groups feel a land acknowledgement is just barely enough.

We are also gathering Diversity Equity and Inclusion (DEI) representatives from across the campus and so the President's Leadership Council was asked to nominate or appoint people to this group. It is a working group of people that have within their job description DEI issues or they chair committees for their college on DEI. We have about 24 people in that group. The purpose or charge of the group is to professionalize the work we are doing and provide resources and a place where people work together on their anti-racism plans. It is a shared learning community and a place to share ideas. This group will meet at least once a semester.

**b. From the Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA):**

As far as COVID compliance, what we are anticipating in Spring 2022 that will be different from this year is that we will have an early cutoff date and if students are not compliant early on in the process they will be dropped. We have spent the better part of a semester working with students. We sent out over 20 communications to students across email, phone, and text. The first semester we were trying to figure it all out, but going into this semester we are going to shift that. My team will be working with Dean d'Alarcao since a number of the start dates are different for their programs. We want students to be compliant two weeks prior to the start of classes, and for most students that will be January 10, 2022. We see this as the direction we are going to head. This is really about new students.

We will be conducting an external review of the Registrar's Office. This is not something new. We do these reviews all the time. This review will be conducted by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admission Officers (ACRO). That will be happening on December 7<sup>th</sup> and December 8<sup>th</sup>. They will also be meeting with members of the Instruction and Student Affairs (I&SA) Committee.

**Questions:**

Q: One of the issues raised by students in my classes regarding COVID is suicides and domestic violence in their extended families, or other forms of marginalization. My immediate response was to talk to the CDO. The second subject my students addressed was about taking mixed modality classes. Students expressed anxiety over having to wear a mask continuously in the classroom and not being able to drink water or remove it to breathe when needed. Also, next week is Thanksgiving and it is a very stressful week for some students. I'm asking for some kind of messaging to go out to remind people to take care of themselves. I'm very concerned. I wouldn't have been as concerned if students hadn't raised the issue of suicide and domestic violence.

A: Thank you for sharing this. I really appreciate it. We are seeing an uptick in conflict resolution issues with our students. There are clearly real challenges going on. In terms of messaging, we always send out some messaging this time of year and I will follow up. We have been doing a lot of suicide intervention programming. As far as students removing their masks in the classroom, they can certainly remove their mask to take a drink of water. I understand that wearing the masks all the time gets old, but we are a very safe campus and it is because we have been following these procedures.

Q: I'd like to ask you something, but not have you answer here today. Take your time and think about it and respond later. In today's newsletter from the Chronicle, there was a discussion on international students and the decline in these students in universities in the U.S. One of the things the newsletter pointed to was the fact that we don't diversify our international recruiting strategy. The newsletter talked about Loyola and how they had begun a recruiting strategy

focusing on Latin America and now have a Latin American population of international students. This is something we should consider. Can you at some point share what our enrollment strategy is going to be and how we are diversifying it?

A: I will be happy to follow up and bring Ruth Huard into the conversation.

**c. From the CSU Statewide Senator:**

The only business at the Academic Senate California State University (ASCSU) is the call for faculty experts. I've been sending these notices out. I'm targeting certain areas rather than sending to the entire Senate, mainly because I'm trying to get feedback and participation in a more tailored manner.

I'd like to congratulate Romey Sabalius, our own faculty trustee, for clearly advocating for faculty wages and equity. His discussion lost by only one vote which means that persistence is a very important thing.

**d. From the Vice President of Administration and Finance (VPAF):**

The only update I have is the new Science building has big panels of glass going up. This is a huge step and we are thrilled.

**Questions:**

Q: How is the search for a new police chief going?

A: It's going. The first round we went through was less than thrilling with the candidates that were brought forward to us. We said no thanks and the search firm has come back with additional candidates that came in on Friday. I haven't looked at them yet but Chief Abeyta is much happier with these candidates. They should be coming to campus sometime in December. If all goes well, we could make an offer in December.

**e. From the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs:**

One thing we are definitely going to have to work on going into the Spring is faculty changing their modality in classes without getting permission. This is has now run into an accommodations issue, particularly with those students that are hard of hearing or deaf. We are talking about a faculty member just deciding to flip the class online and having the accommodations personnel working with the student not be notified. There are all kinds of problems around this issue, not the least of which are contractual issues. It is not an easy fix. People are wholesale changing a class without affirmation. It is something we really have to manage. It is not fair to students and is becoming very problematic. This is something we have to tackle before the third week in January.

**Questions:**

Q: Senator Khan sent out a message asking about the success rate of those modality change requests and I don't know if that information has been provided to the Senate? When faculty make these requests officially are they approved or denied and what is the percentage rate of those approvals?



**A:** I haven't seen that data.

**Q:** I know Senator Khan asked that in the first Senate meeting, so I'm not sure who to ask about that data?

**A:** It went to Joann Wright in University Personnel. Contractually faculty cannot change the modality of the class. This is in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). It is at the discretion of the institution.

**Q:** I understand what you are saying, but there are a lot of faculty that believe that modality is a pedagogical decision.

**A:** That is fair enough, but at the end of the day chairs and directors get to decide how the schedule is put in place. I'm not saying don't drive modality by a pedagogical conversation, but once the schedule of classes go live and the course is in there it needs to be taught the way it is listed there. I'm not against the pedagogical reason for putting something in the schedule of classes as online or other, but a middle of the semester change is not a pedagogical one necessarily. That is what I'm talking about. I do think we need to shift the conversation and give people the space for the pedagogical discussion, and then build the schedule of classes.

**f. From the AS President:**

I would like to remind everyone to be thoughtful about the traumatic history of this holiday and if you could also be mindful of the language you use. There are people that don't have anything they can be grateful for this time of year, and it can be a sensitive subject.

7. The meeting adjourned at 1:34 p.m.

These minutes were taken by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on November 15, 2021. The minutes were edited by Chair McKee on January 9, 2022.

The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on January 12, 2022.