

**Executive Committee Minutes  
February 1, 2021  
via Zoom, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.**

Present: Curry, Day, Del Casino, Delgadillo, Faas, Frazier, Marachi, Mathur, McKee, Peter, Sasikumar, Sullivan-Green, White, Papazian, Wong(Lau),  
Absent: None  
Guest: Barrera

**1. From the Chair:**

Chair Mathur announced that Senate Election materials went out last Thursday in accordance with our scheduled Election Calendar. You may use the Adobe signature fields and pass along the petition or upload to DocuSign. If anyone needs help, please contact Chair Mathur or the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice.

The Senate Retreat is Friday, February 12, 2021 from 9 a.m. to Noon. There will be robust discussion around the post-pandemic university as well as games, such as Jeopardy, and door prizes. Please be sure and RSVP to Vice Chair McKee's calendar invite.

The first spring 2021 Senate meeting is next Monday, February 8, 2021. Please be sure and get any policy recommendations and resolutions to the Senate Administrator by Tuesday or Wednesday this week at the very latest.

2. The Executive Committee approved the consent agenda (Executive Committee Agenda of February 1, 2021, Executive Committee Minutes of January 25, 2021, and the Consent Calendar of February 1, 2021) (15-0-0).

**3. From the President:**

The effort is ongoing to prepare for as much in person instruction for fall 2021 as possible, but the reality is that we just don't know exactly what it will look like in fall. The vaccine rollout has been uneven. There are some interesting things to watch and consider as this unfolds. The Johnson & Johnson vaccine has the capacity to produce much more than current vaccines and is a one dose application. It does require refrigeration but not freezing, which is a very important piece when it comes to reaching rural and hard to reach areas. How quickly these can be rolled out, particularly to our most vulnerable communities, is really a race against the mutant variants of the vaccine. It does look like the COVID relief package that is in front of congress right now, does have funding for the rollout as well as the training of a workforce to administer and help with that process. We should know more in about a month. We are working on the planning. We will have to remain agile and flexible while making our best guess in partnership with the county. Some of you asked whether we have the chance to become a vaccine site that is a real possibility now. There are a lot of details still to be answered including if the vaccine will be available to our campus community and in what capacity and in what way. Hopefully we will know more about this in another week or so. We are pursuing that. I think it will happen, but probably not for several weeks. We will let the campus know more as we know.

Today is the launch of CSU Budget Advocacy Week. We have a series of meetings setup throughout the week with our local delegates and with the various caucuses as well. The AS President and student leadership are involved as well through the California State Student Association (CSSA). It is a big ax this year not only to recover the \$299 million we lost in the last budget cycle, but also to continue to support things like basic needs for students and the Graduation Initiative, mandatory costs, and one time deferred maintenance costs. It is a \$500 billion request. There seems to be a recognition in the legislature that the CSU and UC took a disproportionate cut in the last budget cycle last year and that we are key to the economic recovery of the state. This is part of the argument we are making. Thus far, the budget environment of the state has been positive. This is all relative to an economic crisis and pandemic, but the tax returns and budget thus far is better than was anticipated

in their projections. And, again the COVID-19 \$1.9 trillion package does have dollars for state and local government as well. This could also provide some support. Part of the mandatory cost is for implementation of AB 1460, the Ethnic Studies requirement. This is to continue to hire Ethnic Studies faculty and to continue to support the program in the way and spirit behind the legislation.

Questions:

Q: I know it has been crazy over the last few months, but can you give us any idea when and if you might sign the Student Honors Policy Amendment that was passed by the Senate in November and sent to you?

A: [President] I don't remember having that on my list. There were a number of emergency policies in December and Chair Mathur and I have not met to discuss this particular amendment yet. We will do so right away.

Q: We are getting a lot of concern about what is known about the COVID vaccine and will the campus be getting it. SFSU is holding seminars for their employees. Will SJSU be having anything similar?

A: [Provost] We don't have anything planned right now. If we think there is demand for answers about the differences in vaccines we could set something up, but it will precipitate a lot of questions about when we will have access and we don't know right now. The counties are all different and getting the vaccine at different rates. We are still working on planning. There are still even questions about what tier the education system is in. Those guidelines have not come down from the state yet. That is where we are right now.

[President] Also, depending on where people get the vaccine, you get whatever vaccine they have. You don't get a choice and there is no rhyme or reason to it except the Pfizer vaccine needs deep freezing and that tends to be in the hospitals.

[VP Day] There is no new information and pretty much what you hear on TV is what we know. As we move into the fall and become a vaccination site, we will roll out a substantial campaign to students explaining all their options. We will have to spend some time looking at our population and signs they are affected differently.

C: Just to be clear, that is not what they are talking about at SFSU right now. They are talking about how vaccines work and addressing the fears and mistrust people may have about vaccines. They are setting the stage to make people aware of how vaccines work and what they are.

A: [VP Day] We would include that as well. Right now we are trying to decide where this is heading. We will take a look and see when and if we can do something like this.

[President] Provost Del Casino maybe you can reach out to Audrey and our folks in public health. They may want to do a town hall for faculty and staff, and maybe we might want to do something else for students. It is important to start this now, because when people come back we are not going to be able to require that they get the vaccine. We want to encourage it and make sure they have information about it. We will follow-up on this. Thanks for the question.

Q: My understanding is that we are in Tier 1B, because there is already coordination between the employer and the health care provider such as Kaiser. Is that correct?

A: [President] No, as I understand it, you have to register with Kaiser and then when they get to your category they will send you an invitation to schedule an appointment.

Q: Okay, I was wrong but I don't think I'm the only one wrong. It would be good if that information was more available. My suggestion is that if we want to prioritize limited vaccine and are having face-to-face classes in the fall, perhaps there could be some coordination between SJSU and health care providers to place those faculty and staff that will be coming into direct face-to-face contact with students in a separate priority category? This way it wouldn't become about who registered first at what time and who knew about it.

A: [President] I don't honestly know what is possible in that area, but August is a long way off and depending on how this plays out there could be fairly wide access by July. We don't really have control over the rollout in terms of criteria. That comes from the health care providers and county. We are hearing we will be in Tier 1B which means that all employees would be eligible relatively soon. Most employees 65 and older are already eligible for the vaccine. Each provider is different. Students will probably not be able to get the vaccine until this summer, but we are going to keep our eye on it. We won't be calling the shots on that.

Q: I wanted to add to the encouragement to rollout information. People are asking questions. I really thought we would hear something on January 4, 2021 when we came back. There wasn't any information and that is okay I understand, but I did hear reputable news that there was a poll taken and 25% of those polled did not intend on getting the vaccine even when available. I'm very concerned because people are asking questions and it would be the responsible thing for us to get this information out to our students so they can pass it on to their folks as well. As far as the insurance thing, I started asking my insurance provider as well. I actually have an appointment now for March. I think it is important to give out updates on a weekly basis as to where we are.

A; [President] Thank you. We will get together with our staff and put together something. You are right it is a moving target and it is hard to know where to go.

C: [CDO] We know that vaccine hesitancy is a real cultural, community-based, and equity problem. By getting information out early, hopefully by the time the CDC gets to all of us for vaccinations in late summer, people have had time to think about all the information. We have heard from several different faculty members that have said they will not be getting the vaccine when it comes out because of their concerns about the speed it was produced and its safety. We have been trying to speak with them about it and they are in the age group the CDC says have a high vaccine hesitancy rate. California is actually doing fairly well. We only have a 20% vaccine hesitancy rate, whereas across the country the rate is 56%. We are doing better than other states.

4. Policy Committee Updates:

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

I&SA will be bringing a resolution to the Senate to amend F20-2 to change the WU grade to NC in compliance with the Chancellor's Office instruction on February 8, 2021. I&SA will be talking today about whether we should bring the Credit/No Credit resolution. I will bring to I&SA the discussions we had in Executive Committee and EO 1037. I will explain that all those limits will still apply. We will see what everyone says and if in agreement, we will bring it to the Senate on February 8, 2021. If not, we will send the referral back explaining the reasons. This would not be my preference.

**B. Professional Standards Committee (PS):**

PS will bring the two policy amendments to the Senate on February 8, 2021 that we did not get to at the last Senate meeting in December dealing with the issue of joint appointments. In addition, there could be as many as three additional policy amendments. PS spent much of January meeting with subcommittees working on the Lecturer policy. We hope to bring this as a first reading at the February 8, 2021 Senate meeting. Two other policy amendments have to do with making our RTP policies more inclusive than they are. One will be called "*The Enhancement to Service Amendment*". This puts a little more beef behind the descriptions of service to students and calls out educational equity issues in the criteria for the RTP policy. The second amendment is "*The Scholarship of Engagement or Professional Engagement*". We have had a third category under scholarship of "Professional Activities" that has hardly been used. The intention of that category all along was for faculty to use their expertise in the community around them. We are rewriting that section to be clearer that this is to be included under the category of "Scholarship". We hope to bring this as a first reading at the February 8, 2021 Senate meeting as well. Other items PS is working on are a Sense of the Senate Resolution, *Endorsing the University of Chicago Statement on Academic Freedom* and the 140 mentions of Faculty Affairs in all the old policies. PS will prepare a spreadsheet for the two VPs to look at allocating the rolls where they should now fall.

Questions:

Q: [From the President] Speaking as a faculty member, I remember joint appointments were always tricky for the junior faculty member, because you had to do 100% in both places. Faculty that had say a 75%/25% split basically became like an adjunct in the 25% department. They weren't as engaged. I appreciate you taking this on. However, institutionally we have never been able to do this in a way that supports the faculty

member and gains the benefit of it. I'm very interested in how you will go about this. It is a very hard issue to resolve.

A: I agree with you entirely. I have disagreed in principle with the notion of joint appointments as long as I have been on PS, except at the senior level for that very reason. I think a joint appointment once you are done with RTP is a very different kind of thing. Under previous administrations there had been a few of them, but the decision had been made not to do any more. Under Elna Green we were counting them down. When we revised the RTP policy I asked if we needed to include them and Elna said no we are trying to get rid of them. That is where I thought it was going to go, but over the last couple years there have been some joint appointments and now we need to do something with them, because they have been appointed across departments and colleges in lines. I'm just trying to do the best I can to provide a simplified evaluation system given that other people have made the decision to continue them.

Q: [President Papazian] I appreciate that. I haven't had this conversation with the Provost so he is probably wondering what I'm talking about. There are some reasons for having it, but we must protect the faculty member. I'm going to step out of this conversation now, because this is really an academic issue for the Provost.

[Provost] I held a joint appointment at Cal State Long Beach. Intellectually the benefits are there. The question really is the letter that governs the work. Some of the ways we got around that is that I had to serve on two department committees and we counted that as service. There was less of a service requirement in other areas. I had a 51%/49% appointment and it was done this way so I didn't have a home department. They are complicated but when you think of something like Ethnic Studies, there could be a good reason to hire someone say jointly in Public Health and Chicano/Chicanx Studies. They are a little challenging to evaluate.

C: [Provost] The scholarship and engagement piece is critical. However, it does need to be linked to peer review. It needs to be acknowledged that peer review is still a component of that. It is critical that we ensure peer review is still the standard. There are multiple ways you can get peer review.

C: In the definition of scholarship, we will have a phrase which adds external review to the various ways of reviewing this kind of work, so there will be various ways available to faculty to ensure their professional engagement is reviewed appropriately.

Q: What happens when there isn't a member of the department on the review committee?

A: I will double check the language with the committee today, I think we are making reference to the department committees.

### **C: Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):**

C&R will be spending most of this semester wrapping up the General Education Guidelines. The American Institutions Review Panel has been formed and emails went out today. The Ethnic Studies Review Panel closed on Friday and they should be appointed soon. One discipline is missing and Chair Mathur will be working with the Ethnic Studies Department. C&R should be bringing the guidelines to the Senate in March 2021 and hopefully wrapping this up in April 2021. We don't want to have to finish this at the May meeting.

C&R also has a large amount of curriculum that has come forward this semester. There are about 12 programs in Occupational Therapy. There are also a lot of new degree programs coming forward. I want to ask this group about these right now. These new programs are degree completion programs. Essentially what they are doing is targeting people in the community that never finished their Baccalaureate degree. In order to get into these programs, the student would have had to have completed all their lower division classes. There are several of these coming through the pipeline and many are offered in Special Sessions. There isn't much guidance from the Chancellor's Office about why programs should be offered Special Session. The one we are looking at today is a degree completion program in the College of Education and the target audience is people working

in the K-12 system who got their jobs without having a Baccalaureate degree. It makes sense, but doesn't make sense having it in special session. That creates what I believe is a socioeconomic gap, because these students work for minimum wage and the tuition rate in special session is very high. These students may have to take out student loans and it is not clear what their job prospects will be when they complete the degree. These classes could easily be in regular session for less cost. This may be an equity issue to consider.

C: [Provost] I'm not sure the purview of the C&R committee is to get into the financial efficacy of programs for students. I'm not really sure that is a curriculum and research question, but I will address it in the sense that special session is not necessarily more expensive and there are a number of reasons for that. These students are Pell eligible and the rates are probably higher for special session than our regular session students. The second thing I would say is that because we have complete pricing control, we can do a lot of things including discounting should we need to with partnerships with various school districts, etc. The sticker price you see on the program, might not be what it ends up being for various students. However, I'm conflicted on what role C&R has in asking these questions.

C: C&R is allowed to ask these questions for new degree programs under University Policy S93-14.

C: [Provost] I still don't think it is fair. If this becomes a big issue, we can walk through what it actually costs someone.

Q: Doesn't special session make them pay the full tuition as opposed to the regular session where it is discounted and also has state support?

Q: What is the rate per unit right now on the state side?

A: That I don't know. They provided the rate for special session per unit, but not stateside.

C: [Provost] Remember there are no fees in self-support, so if you take the total cost of instruction and divide it by 12, which is how they develop the credit hour, what do you get? Then compare that. Pell eligibility is higher and tuition is higher, but people are going to be eligible for more resources. The other thing is our average student does not finish in four years. So, take the average graduation rate of let's say five and take their total tuition package and multiply by five years and then see what the cost is. If you are paying by credit hour and only take 60 units, you are going to pay less than paying the total tuition for the year for five years. This is clearly a complicated process.

C: I think they should definitely do that calculation. That should at least be provided at this point to show if it is the same or cheaper.

Q: So, what was the per unit price they gave?

A: I can't remember

C: We did pass a Sense of the Senate Resolution requiring every policy committee to take an equity lens to every policy they pass and in their activities. It is our responsibility to ensure students are not being price gouged and to take that equity lens. Equity is the responsibility for every person on this campus.

C: [Provost] I calculated \$125 a unit.

Q: Are the classes available during regular session? Many of the courses in the College of Education are available in the evening so it isn't an access issue. From an equity lens and quality of education, who would be teaching these courses in special session?

A: According to the application, they are saying they would have to hire lecturers to teach these courses, because there are not enough faculty in the college. Most of these courses are in the College of Education. The department would ultimately be responsible for hiring the lecturers. Most of these courses are from CHAD and some from EDEL. If it was EDEL 102, that no longer exists. It is now EDTE 224, Educational Psychology, which is the course I teach and I was not consulted about this at all.

C: As far as the quality, the length of time in Special Session is going to be more of an indicator of the quality. It is one of the factors I should say. If it is a short period of time that could be a quality issue. The total cost is \$25,500 to do 60 units in special session. They don't have to pay all the other fees, but they don't have access to things like the student wellness center and things like that.

C: [Provost] It is totally an online program as I understand it. You are looking at about \$24,000 on the main campus. Again, the Pell eligibility rate is likely to be higher in this program which will reduce the cost. From a planning perspective, it is very simple. Every class and every unit cost x number of dollars. The other thing I said is we can negotiate with various school districts to create discounts ourselves in special session.

Q: Wouldn't that be an equity issue then if we are doing that for certain people in the program and not for others? They are saying this could involve school districts, but would involve other audiences as well. I think that makes it even more problematic.

A: [Provost] If you want to get into an equity question, what is equity in this context? Is it everyone paying the same price, because everyone that goes to SJSU now doesn't pay the same price? The other question is do we differentiate the cost of the instruction? If you want to look through an equity lens, then you should be paying a lot more for an Engineering degree than for a Humanities degree at SJSU, a lot more. We don't do that right now. The costs are complicated. The question of equity also ties to access. Are we going to create programs that are fully online and accessible to adult learners with a fixed price model that allows them to pace out their courses over a period of time without having to worry about things like fee increases and other kinds of things like that, or are you going to allow an online space to emerge where adult learners can have access to an education they never had before. Is that the equity? If it's just in a pricing model then we need to have a much larger conversation. We would have to blow up the entire pricing model of the CSU to produce equity relative to cost of instruction.

C: The concern that I have is based on the target audience. These are people who work in K-12. They don't have degrees and probably have families and they are not making that much. If they are Pell eligible then that is great, but I just think if you are going to promote this everything needs to be on the table so the students getting into this know what they are getting into. If they have to take out excessive student loans, they need to know they aren't going to come out of this with a teaching credential. If they drop out and have student loans, they need to know they are going to have to pay them.

C: [Provost] I agree, but I would much rather have them advised by our student financial aid counselors than National University or Ashford and that is where many of these students end up going to. They go into space in for profit education that gouge them and take in federal dollars at huge rates. We provide no opportunity to address this at all in the CSU right now so for me where equity and access are brought into this conversation, we are providing them access and affordability. We need to have special session financial aid counselors dedicated to degree completion students. Maybe what we need is a larger infrastructure conversation about how we support adult learners at this university. I think there is a lot of value and equity here. If those are questions that need to be answered we can work on this.

C: There are plenty of students who have dropped out for a long time and whose courses they took at that time don't meet the requirements any longer in the CSU. So we will need dedicated counselors to work with these people who can make a good analysis as to how long it will take them to be eligible for these programs.

Q: If special session students aren't paying fees for access to our infrastructure, then they would have to have their own infrastructure correct?

A: [Provost] No, we tax back the campus out of special session to pay for the components we are talking about. It is tax embedded in special session. There is support. The price per unit is significantly lower than market if you look at ASU, National, and Arizona. They are charging \$525 per unit and even one of our CSU's is charging \$625 per unit. We are just trying to get to a sustainable place. This is an expansion of access issue, which in my opinion needs to be tied into the equity conversation.

C: That is missing from this application.

C: [Provost] Maybe it isn't missing from the application, but that we haven't explained better the overall context of how we will do this work as a campus. Maybe I need to put this down on paper, then every program won't have to answer this themselves. These are

really institutional questions not College of Education issues. My team and I need to clarify what this infrastructure looks like to drive this and then you can frame each program in it. Would that be helpful? In the meantime, I'm more than happy to talk to the C&R crew.

**D. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):**

As you may remember at the January 11, 2021 meeting, O&G brought some temporary amendments to the research policies. Today, O&G will be considering permanent amendments to those policies to bring to the full Senate on February 8, 2021.

**5. Presentation by Dr. Magdalena Barrera, Interim Vice Provost for Faculty Success:**

I wanted to come today and provide you with BIPOC faculty feedback on the RTP process and let you know some of the things my office has going on to address this feedback and then ask some critical questions about how we support our policies. I shared with you a handout that summarizes the feedback that we got from a special session with about 30 Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) faculty members. We asked them questions about their racial and ethnic identities and how it relates to them and their professional lives and then what their experience has been at SJSU. Key issues and themes that emerged from our meetings:

1. A concern that evaluators are minimizing contributions across areas of achievement.
2. In terms of RSCA, there is a feeling that diversity-related RSCA is not perceived as real research.
3. In terms of academic assignment, there is a concern about the overreliance on SOTEs, especially question 13.
4. A concern that Peer Evaluation is the only way to access someone's achievement in academic assignment.
5. A concern that nontraditional forms of service are overlooked and undervalued.

The second theme is that evaluator feedback is inconsistent across the levels of review. There is vague feedback without clear guidance about ways to fix it.

The third theme is that faculty would really like to know they have advocates at the table. Even though these are private and confidential conversations is it possible for the faculty member to have an advocate there to help explain their file and defend them in a way.

The fourth theme is ongoing frustration with e-Faculty.

The fifth theme is that despite these challenges there was a deep desire to continue building community and engaging in discussions about RTP.

These five themes reflect what decades of scholarship already have told us about the experiences of women of color faculty in different university processes whether that is hiring, teaching, service, etc. You can see that outlined on these handouts. There is the issue of presumed incompetence, isolation and exclusion, cultural taxation and labor, less sponsorship and mentorship, and epidemic exclusion among multiple axes. The area where all of these themes meet across the board is in RTP.

Some things that my office is doing in response to this feedback is:

1. We have organized a series of monthly BIPOC faculty gatherings that will take place this semester. Each is a mix of ongoing community building, RTP Topics, career advice, and also time to share and discuss experiences and insights.
2. Sharing this information with the Executive and Professional Standards Committees, the Deans and the UCCD.
3. The PS Committee is working to revise the RTP policies to reflect educational equity.
4. Develop a campaign to encourage departments to develop and file RTP guidelines

that can provide support and guidance for evaluators who are looking at their colleague's materials.

In reviewing this feedback there are questions we need to ask ourselves:

1. What can and should be addressed immediately, and what may require more thorough discussions and planning over time?
2. What are ways of partnering with my colleagues so that their voices, experiences, and ideas are integrated into the work of making RTP more transparent and equitable?
3. What can we do to enable a social shift on campus especially when it comes to evaluators serving on these committees, so they really embrace the honor and responsibility of their role?

Questions/Comments:

Q: Thank you so much for your presentation and the work that you've done. In the event that you have described, I'm interested in process and outreach. I wonder if there are faculty who are BIPOC who are not aware of these events? I'm involved in the Senate and very active in RTP, and I had never heard about this before today. In terms of representation of voices, you said it went out to faculty of color but how do we identify who was included in the sample? Also, are the folks that participated aware that their input is being shared?

A: Thanks for those questions. As far as the people invited, we tried to piece together a list of folks that we knew were BIPOC and in the invitations that went out we asked people to spread the information by word of mouth. That is one answer. As far as the representation of voices, the people who attended the sessions were different ranks and identities. They are aware their feedback would be shared. They want to see what happens after they share this feedback.

Q: I find number 4, in terms of encouraging departments to develop guidelines, very interesting. However, there is some inequity in that process as well. We've had some issues in my own department, in terms of developing those guidelines, and voices were silenced in that process as well. That needs to be accounted for and a cultural shift has to occur in everyone utilizing those guidelines in review. What I have heard people saying is that there are guidelines, but I'll rely on my own good judgment. There is inequity in developing those guidelines, pressure on people to vote in those guidelines, and differences in how evaluators utilize those guidelines.

A: That is an important point. For my upcoming presentation to the UCCD next week, I'd like to develop a version of this handout with a checklist and list of questions about critical things we need to think about to make this process more equitable and to address some of the feedback that has been shared.

C: Crafting a policy and making it equitable is only the first step. The next step is bringing equity and inclusion into the RTP evaluations.

C: Yes, the question is how do we help BIPOC faculty in preparing for RTP as well as preparing the evaluators? In addition, this year we have to address how the impacts of COVID will fit into RTP.

C: Many years ago we focused on making materials accessible for those students who needed it. What we found was that all students benefited from it. I think if we create a better culture to support BIPOC faculty, all faculty will benefit as well.

C: We all stand to benefit from this effort.

6. The meeting adjourned at 1:33 p.m.

These minutes were taken by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on February 1, 2021. The minutes were transcribed by the Senate Administrator on February 17, 2021. The minutes were reviewed by Chair Mathur on February 17, 2021. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on February 22, 2021.