

Executive Committee Minutes
February 22, 2021
via Zoom, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Present: Curry, Day, Del Casino, Faas, Frazier, Marachi, Mathur, McKee, Peter, Sasikumar, Sullivan-Green, White, Wong(Lau), Delgadillo

Absent: Papazian

1. There was no dissent to the Consent Calendar of February 22, 2021 as amended by Senator Marachi to include Sofia Moede as a staff-at-large member on the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Committee (ADAPC).
2. A motion was made to approve the Senate Calendar of 2021-2022, the Appointment Calendar of 2021, and the Election Calendar of 2022. The motion was seconded. The committee voted and the motion passed (14-0-0).
3. **Policy Committee Updates:**
 - a. **Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):**

C&R will not be bringing any resolutions to the Senate for the March 1, 2021 meeting. C&R is working on the Accessibility policy and the General Education (GE) Guidelines. C&R will be reviewing the Doctoral program in Occupational Therapy today and continuing the review of feedback they received on GE (over 25 pages of feedback).
 - b. **Organization and Government Committee (O&G):**

O&G is working on a Sense of the Senate Resolution regarding Native American students, staff, and faculty for the March 1, 2021 Senate Meeting. O&G will be asking for a taskforce to investigate the number of Native Americans in these groups in more detail, because it is difficult to pinpoint the exact number due to classification issues. O&G will also be having a visit from the University Library Board (ULB) today to discuss the reasons for a proposed expansion of the ULB membership.

Questions:

Q: Have you seen the data that Institutional Research has done that pulls apart more than one race to help identify Native American students on campus?

A: We did discuss this in committee last week. Soma de Bourbon is a committee member and she pointed out last week that the numbers are not showing all the Native Americans.

C: That is 100% true. What we did was back into the data and what we found is that there are 20 official Native Americans and almost 800 that are of more than one race on campus. The Provost will find the report and send that data on to O&G.

C: Appreciate that those numbers are being pulled together. The numbers are not consistently pulled through on the campus for other assessments. It is something that needs to happen. This is one of the gaps in equity on campus.

The CDO spent two years trying to get the Chancellor's Office to have this information available on the dashboards. It is now available on some, but not all of the dashboards.

C: If you want, I can give you a quick look at the data now. We are declining in numbers from a high of 1,253 Native American students across groups in 2014 to 765 in 2019. We are trying to figure out how to report this through Institutional Research so that we still have the official report that we need to have for the CSU, but also show the actual numbers for our campus. We might be able to add Fall 2020 data.

C: The equity gap for time to graduation as well as matriculation is greater for Southeast Asian Frosh than it is for Latinx and Black Frosh, but this is not so for transfer students. For transfer students, Southeast Asian students did better than Latinx and Black students. When you are looking at the Graduation Initiative 2025, there is no focus on APIs at all even though we know we have a huge chunk of our population on campus who is struggling with the equity gap. They are hidden by the performance of Chinese and South Asian students. In some categories they are even higher than White students. Southeast Asian students are the majority of our Asian American students on campus, but they are largely invisible on campus.

C: I guarantee most people don't know that. Cultural stereotyping has to do with this as well.

C: There is a lot of work to be done as far as awareness.

C: We are a very different looking campus than any other campus in the CSU. These type of graphs would be very helpful. This is why we are hiring in IESA. We will be getting that information online soon. This will also give faculty the opportunity to do research on our community.

C: It is also an opportunity to see what structural supports are needed on our campus.

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

I&SA is focusing on two things, credit/no credit and grade forgiveness. We have a referral to get it straightened out, because Peoplesoft is not handling it properly. We have also discovered that grade forgiveness affects credit/no credit as we are dealing with these things. For example, do credit/no credit classes count toward grade forgiveness units or the grade averaging units, because they don't count towards the GPA. I&SA may not have anything for the Senate at the March 1, 2021 meeting even though we were hoping to bring something forward. This would mean we could end up in a situation where a resolution would come for a final reading at our April meeting.

Questions:

Q: Am I correct that we have two full Senate meetings in March 2021?

A: Yes, March 1 and March 22, 2021.

A: Maybe I&SA could bring it to the March 22, 2021 meeting. We will be soliciting feedback in some sort of structured way from students.

d. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

PS is continuing to work on RTP reform and the Lecturer policy. Today we will be looking at department RTP guidelines as well as public health guidelines, which tie into RTP reform because public health guidelines are infused with discussion of the scholarship of engagement. There are two prongs to RTP reform that we have been looking at. One prong is trying to do something to infuse equity language into the policy. We focused initially on the 'service to students' prong, because that language was inadvertently deleted from the 2015 policy. The second prong is the scholarship of engagement language. For our meeting last week, we invited Jamal Williams and Patience Bryant. We had a robust conversation. The deeper we got into the meeting, the more we realized this was a much bigger issue than the small amendment we were proposing as the Provost told us at the last Senate meeting. PS believes we are headed is not for a small amendment this year on the service component, but a Sense of the Senate Resolution asking the Senate to endorse a year-long reform effort for next year to infuse equity language into multiple parts of the RTP policy. We will discuss this more today and lay out a series of steps and consultations and so forth aimed at a longer term effort. As for the scholarship of engagement, we are planning to bring that resolution for a first reading at the March 1, 2021 Senate meeting. We've gotten extensive feedback on the lecturer policy. There has been a difference of opinion on the use of honorific titles. Joanne Wright pointed out that many of the titles are not in the contract and they should not be used if they are not in the contract. We are suggesting one new honorific title, if the administration accepts it, of **Senior Lecturer**. We are working on a compromise there. There was language introducing the RTP policy in 2015 having to do with documents inserted into a faculty member's dossier without their permission for purposes of evaluation. The contract does permit this. Faculty Affairs had the authority to screen the documents inserted and then the faculty member had the opportunity to give a rebuttal. We cut and pasted that section from the RTP policy into the Lecturer policy. Joanne Wright is very uncomfortable with this. That leaves PS in an awkward place. Do we take the language out or revise it in some way? If we do that then we have another problem on our hands. How do we explain to lecturer faculty that they can't have the same protections that tenure/tenure-track faculty have in their evaluations? We are between a rock and a hard place here. PS wanted to put you all on notice of this.

Questions:

Q: Did Joanne Wright say why she was uncomfortable with this and is it because the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) permits it?

A: I would rather share her comments with you directly than try to tell you myself. It does have to do with a couple of terms that are also legal terms. In other words, they might be viewed one way to the average person, but to a legal professional they can be viewed another way. I think one of the terms was "inflammatory."

A: We thought it was important for our lecturer faculty to see that we thought they were important enough to have the same protections as our tenure/tenure-track faculty.

C: I do believe that PS knows my views on this. We should not be treating our Lecturers as second class citizens and should be providing them the same kind of protections as our tenure/tenure-track faculty. We should be very careful of just moving in this legalistic direction and think of what is ethical and the right thing to do for people who are very important contributors and stakeholders on our campus.

C: I agree. If it is a matter of changing the language then it should be changed for tenure/tenure-track as well.

C: We should move away from language in the CBA. The CBA is the minimal language.

C: It is difficult for people to understand the interaction of the CBA and policy. There is one philosophy that says if the CBA doesn't say it, then university policy can't either. Then there is a different philosophy that says if the CBA doesn't say you can't do it, then you can do it. It is clear there has been a change in philosophy over the last 10 years at SJSU in how to apply the CBA. This is a change that I think is kind of destructive in the long run.

C: Inclusivity is something this campus is supposed to value and this speaks to that. These protections are important and largely symbolic in our culture of inclusivity.

The odds are pretty good that the Lecturer policy would probably come as another 1st reading for the March 1, 2021 meeting, or it may not come until the March 22, 2021 Senate meeting.

4. Updates from the Administrators, CSU Statewide Senator, AS President:

a. From the AS President:

AS has a new virtual book reading program. About 40 or more students have expressed an interest in it. When we move back on campus it will be in the AS House.

AS has been hosting virtual events as part of Black History Month.

AS Elections are open. There is a virtual election application on their website. If you know any students interested in running let the AS President know.

Transportation Solutions now has the Smart Pass 2021.

The AS Marketing Team created a, "where do AS fees go" flyer that gives a breakdown of where the fees go.

AS received their final occupancy permit by the Fire Marshall and state and can now move back into the AS House.

Questions:

Q: What is the book you are reading?

A: I don't really know, but once I find out I'll let you know.

C: I'm in a book club and our book is ***Four Hundred Souls*** which is really an amazing book. It is a community history of African-Americans from 1619-2019. I would highly recommend it.

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

The good news is that we have an under 1% positive COVID rate out of 900 students returning to the residence halls. As we move forward the challenges are that we are going to have some very strict controls in the residence halls. This can lead to feelings of isolation. This means we may have to have some difficult conversations with students and some could end up with the revocation of licensing agreements i.e. being removed from the residence hall. When this happens, all of the sudden people become very sympathetic. What I would say to all of us is it is a more difficult conversation to tell a parent why their child is sick. I'm putting it out there for you to be aware of when you hear stories of housing being unfair. We have to keep in mind that we are a Hispanic serving institution and some of these populations have been disproportionately hit by COVID. These students will be going home on the weekends and breaks and that can have a lot of impact. We are going to have to be more serious than we have ever been before and diligent in sticking to our rules. Athletics has had even more challenges, but they have handled it very well. We remain a very safe campus at this point.

Questions:

Q: Thank you. You are the first person to speak to the impact of COVID on specific groups and that death is a part of that. I appreciate that. Of those 900 students, what is the racial/ethnic breakdown as well as national/international?

A: I need to check. Last time I checked was last semester and it was close to what our student population looks like. There were more Latinx students than Asian students. I apologize I can't pull it up at the moment. As we are talking, I'll continue to look for it and send it to you. I think the number of Black students was close or outpaced the Black student population, because we know 50% of those students are coming from Southern California so that makes some sense. The student athlete population would push that number a little bit. What it means is that the students living in the residence halls match our student population. There is a very real dynamic associated with wanting to keep our students safe and also wanting to ensure the communities they return to stay safe as well.

Q: As greater numbers of students return to campus and greater controls get put into place, does violation of these controls result in revocation of license agreements?

A: Yes, what I would say is we will probably see a tightening this spring and then we are anticipating a larger number of students coming back in the fall with the potential for more incidents. You don't go from violation to automatic revocation. You get a warning, then probation, and then revocation. What I think we are going to see is that a lot of folks think they should get probation again when they get revocation. This is a very difficult thing. The reality is if we are going to keep our residences safe we are not going to be able to do some of the things we used to in residence halls. In that kind of environment, we don't have a margin for error. There will be a line where we will say because of the serious choices you have made, you have also chosen not to be a member of our residence community.

c. From the Provost and Senior VP for Academic Affairs:

Chair Mathur announced that the Provost had to leave early today and she had forgotten to move him up in the rotation. The Provost made the following comments before leaving.

That's okay Chair Mathur. I only had one thing I wanted to say, which is to mention the referral I've made to the O&G Committee to dissolve the University Sabbatical Committee. I could talk more about that and what is going on there. It could be helpful for us to redistribute sabbatical dollars around campus. I asked around a few campuses and not everyone has a University Sabbatical Committee. Many have department sabbatical committees. The truth is as you get farther away from the department, it becomes harder to dissect the intellectual work and this is a disadvantage to some colleges. For example, last year one college got 100% of their sabbaticals, and another college only got 33%. It is very hard to rank them at the university level. The colleges and the deans can do a better job of understanding what they have. This would mean redistributing the total sabbaticals. Long term we need to figure out how to invest more in sabbaticals anyway. This might produce more equity. My request is to get rid of the University Sabbatical Committee and allow the colleges to control this.

C: In my college I've often been astounded by the amount of work we do to rank the proposals that seems to be completely ignored at the University level.

A: Again, I don't think it is their fault, it is really hard to read these against each other. It is also the writing. At the end of the day, I don't see this adding value to the University. I talked to the President and she said she doesn't need to be involved in Sabbaticals. The bigger concern is will people be concerned if we get rid of this level.

d. From the Chief Diversity Officer (CDO):

Notifications have been sent out to people to secure their acceptance on the campus Committee on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion. Once those are received, the President will send out appointment letters.

The biggest project we are working on this semester is with the College of Health and Human Sciences. We are looking at dismantling racism within the health sciences and this is being led by Michelle Hampton who is a faculty fellow and being supported by the CDO. We are working with CSU East Bay and three other universities. We are now working with seven fellows from within the college and are gearing up for a half day summit on April 7, 2021 from 9 a.m. to noon. We are putting together a much longer asynchronous summer institute which will have a synchronous kickoff as well as a campus based course similar to the way a course was put together for online teaching for our faculty. We are looking at a collaboration with five other campuses with SJSU being the lead campus. We are involving all of the departments but two—aviation and recreation management, because they don't have the same curricular considerations. That is pretty exciting. Our office will be staffing a lot of the logistics for the first summit.

We received a letter from the Staff Council asking the President and CDO to ensure that the Staff Council and staff leaders are integrated into our racial equity work particularly around systemic racism and Black Lives Matter.

The CDO was invited by the Family Advisory Board to speak with them about what we do on the Committee for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion as well as what some of our top concerns are on campus as related to racism. That meeting went well. There were some pretty hard questions around policing and the treatment of Black faculty and staff on campus, and what efforts we are making to work with families about their concerns for their children/students on campus.

The CDO is working with the Vice President for Research and Innovation (VPRI), Mohamed Abousalem, to frame most of their work within a racial equity framework. We are trying very hard to provide materials and guidance to help them redesign some of the things they are doing so that faculty feel that Research and Innovation is accessible and there isn't gatekeeping and other things going on. That is a long term project.

We are finding that a lot of the exclusionary behavior that occurs gets very complicated when in a virtual environment. By the same token, there is a lot of evidence that can be captured, such as pictures or chat and other information that can be downloaded.

The CDO received a lot of comments in the last week regarding the memo sent out by her office regarding anti-Asian violence in the community. Many Asian students are not allowing their elderly parents to go out by themselves any longer. Even the CDO won't allow her parents out alone. The CDO is also not running by herself in the mornings any longer. A few of her colleagues on other campus have expressed the same fears. Chair Mathur expressed her

gratitude on behalf of the Academic Senate and many of her colleagues at SJSU to the CDO for the message she sent out and acknowledged that the faculty stand in solidarity with the CDO on this issue.

e. From the CSU Statewide Representative:

At the Academic Senate California State University (ASCSU) we have been talking quite a bit about the status of lecturers and there are two different projects. One project has to do with representation in terms of dedicated seats on the ASCSU for lecturers only. There is some discussion about the use of the term **contingent faculty**. This goes back to what Ken Peter, the Chair of the PS Committee, was talking about earlier and the language in the CBA. One of the terms that is being thrown around is **not tenure/tenure-track**. I warned against this particular title because it is a little bit like **not White**. Defining oneself by what one is not is never a good idea.

All of the other issues being addressed in the ASCSU are for faculty in general. One of the big things that is being talked about is faculty burnout, morale, and angst regarding the face-to-face return to instruction in the fall with what people continue to feel is very little information about vaccinations and safety measures. It doesn't mean we are not getting any information, it just means it is different at every campus and people are concerned about it. There is a move to request the Chancellor's Office issue systemwide guidelines on repopulation taking into consideration there are many unknowns and that there are different county and department guidelines. People believe that the Chancellor's Office ought to be able to get those counties to give them information. The other area has to do with division of labor, stresses around caretaking, and a relevant discussion around the fact that many of our students are either parents or caretakers of siblings/parents and the need for the CSU to consider that parenting and caretaking is something that is being ignored or not being addressed systemically in terms of how COVID is affecting individuals.

Another issue is around sensibility around the lack of community reporting of faculty and staff who have passed away as a result of COVID. Since we have been sheltered, some campuses have been doing memorial announcements about people that have died. For instance, on our campus Buddy Butler. When we go back what will we say to people about them at that point? Some Senates do honor the people who have passed and do a photo and statement and invite their family members to attend by zoom and offer a moment of silence. Which might be a very good thing to do.

Another thing you might find interesting was the announcement at the Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting about the person who will replace AVC Lauren Blanchard and their salary. It was announced that this person's salary would be \$350,000 with an additional \$6,000 monthly for housing. Given that we have been talking about lecturers there was talk about how there isn't even a

small amount given to faculty for their housing expenses. Right after that we had a report about Silicon Valley housing costs and that was part of why people were discussing that.

Lastly, there was some discussion about zoom meetings and some not so nice behavior in Chat. There was a report that there is among our ASCSU Senators some hostile attacks in terms of their communication in Chat. It isn't always private. There is some concern about what is going to happen with that. This sets the tone for how they engage with each other and there is gaslighting.

There were two memos sent out this morning. One was regarding the temporary suspension of a section of EO 1037, and the other was regarding the National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ). Basically, they decided that they didn't feel like there was a need for improvement in teacher preparation so they are going to ignore that particular recommendation.

Questions:

Q: Thank you for the update. It is good to see the CSU calling out the NCTQ. It has been an organization that has for years put out what they call research, but it is a really deeply flawed methodology and I'll send an email link to what I've found regarding their methodology.

f. From the Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF):

Over the weekend we were working with the county to try and get SJSU as a vaccination site for Santa Clara County, but the county has decided not to use SJSU as one of their options. They are using the Fairgrounds and Levi Stadium. We are disappointed. We are still working with Kaiser to try and see if we can get them here. We are very disappointed. We thought we had a really good setup at the SPX and the 4th Street Parking Garage. We thought it was good because the east side of San José is woefully short of clinics. That is not going to work for right now as they county doesn't think they can appropriately staff the site..

Questions:

Q: Thanks for sending out the Clery report. I've been hearing about additional reports of robberies on campus. Is there anything we should be doing?

A: There are a lot less people here and a lot less eyeballs to see and watch things. Doors continue to be propped open. We went to everyone having a Tower ID Card to get into a building for this reason. However, I have a video of a gentlemen walking the halls of the Clark Building at 3 a.m. on a Sunday, so how did he get in? My team is investigating this. He attempted to break into a number of offices. The offices he attempted to break into were odd. When you don't have people watching, that stuff happens. It is winter time and people are looking for shelter or to take things. Normally, we wouldn't see this, but we are now. It is worse on South Campus. No one was down there to

watch. It isn't less safe, it is just that people are not there to watch. We had an incident in Clark on the 5th floor where we weren't even sure if anything was missing because we moved people while they were working remotely and many have not even unpacked. We are doing our best. Don't let anyone tailgate behind you. Make sure the door shuts behind you before you leave.

Q: I happen to know that the Political Science Office was broken into and a computer was taken as well as some items from the mailroom right next to the Political Science Office. Do you know if there is any progress there?

A: I'm assuming this was reported to UPD right?

Q: I wasn't the one who discovered it. I'm assuming since it was announced at the department meeting that it was reported. I haven't heard anything further in terms of an investigation and whether there was any potential for identity theft?

A: If you can get me the date and time, I'll look into this.

C: It is my understanding that it was a cluster of offices and that it was reported.

C: In our case, we heard it first from UPD. It was strange since our admin's door was busted open and stuff taken from her office.

Q: On other campuses there have been announcements sent to faculty about where they can get vaccinations. Is SJSU planning something like this? I've been helped a lot by the CDO because she posts a lot of information, but I'm just wondering if SJSU is going to be posting any announcements?

C: I've heard other people say, "Why isn't SJSU posting announcements?"

A: Our county has been slow to tell us where to go and what the process is. Santa Clara County has also been limited in the amount of vaccines they have. Until next week, education won't even be in the vaccination space. When we know something for certain and can send it out we absolutely will.

C: Alameda is way ahead of many counties. They are already vaccinating Tier 1B. Santa Clara County is so disorganized. It is really frustrating.

5. The meeting adjourned at 1:40 p.m.

These minutes were taken on February 22, 2021 by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, and transcribed on March 3, 2021. The minutes were reviewed by Chair Mathur on March 5, 2021. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on March 8, 2021.