SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE
2020/2021
Agenda
May 10, 2021, 2:00 pm – 4:00 pm
via Zoom: https://sjsu.zoom.us/j/85019006138

If you would like to attend this meeting, please contact the Chair (Ravisha.Mathur@sjsu.edu) or the Senate Administrator (Eva.Joice@sjsu.edu) for the password.

I. Call to Order and Roll Call:

II. Land Acknowledgement:

III. Approval of Minutes:
Senate Minutes of April 19, 2021

IV. Communications and Questions:
A. From the Chair of the Senate
B. From the President of the University

V. Executive Committee Report:
A. Minutes of the Executive Committee –
EC Minutes of April 12, 2021
EC Minutes of April 26, 2021

B. Consent Calendar –
Consent Calendar of May 10, 2021

C. Executive Committee Action Items –

VI. Unfinished Business:

VII. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation):
A. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
AS 1818, Policy Recommendation, Undergraduate Advising (Final Reading) with Appendix A, Executive Summary

B. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
AS 1810, Policy Recommendation, Amendment E to University Policy S14-5, Adopting new Program Learning Outcomes for General Education (Final Reading)

AS 1817, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds S68-18, Special Major (Final Reading)

C. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

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

AS 1819, Policy Recommendation, Amendment D to University Policy F15-9, Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) (Final Reading)

AS 1820, Policy Recommendation, Amendment D to University Policy S08-4, Campus Planning Board (CPB) (Final Reading)

AS 1821, Senate Management Resolution, Amends SM-S05-6, Creating a Faculty Diversity Committee (Final Reading)

E. University Library Board (ULB):

VIII. Special Committee Reports:

IX. New Business:

X. State of the University Announcements:

A. Vice President for Administration and Finance
B. Vice President for Student Affairs
C. Chief Diversity Officer
D. SJSU Faculty Trustee (by standing invitation)
E. Statewide Academic Senators
F. Provost
G. Associated Students President

XI. Adjournment

2021-2022 Academic Senate Minutes
April 19, 2021

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

Ex Officio: Present: Van Selst, Curry, Rodan, Mathur, McKee, Delgadillo Absent: None	**CHHS Representatives:** Present: Grosvenor, Sen, Smith, Schultz-Krohn Absent: None
Administrative Representatives: Present: Day, Faas, Del Casino, Wong(Lau), Papazian Absent: None	**COB Representatives:** Present: Rao Absent: Khavul
Deans / AVPs: Present: Lattimer, Ehrman, d'Alarcao, Shillington Absent: None	**COED Representatives**: Present: Marachi Absent: None
Students: Present: Kaur, Quock, Chuang, Gomez, Birrer Absent: Walker	**ENGR Representatives:** Present: Sullivan-Green, Saldamli, Okamoto Absent: None
Alumni Representative: Absent: Walters	**H&A Representatives:** Present: Kitajima, Khan, Frazier, Taylor, Thompson, Riley Absent: None
Emeritus Representative: Present: McClory	**COS Representatives:** Present: Cargill, French, White, Maciejewski Absent: None
Honorary Representative: Present: Lessow-Hurley, Buzanski	**COSS Representatives:** Present: Peter, Hart, Sasikumar, Wilson, Raman Absent: None
General Unit Representatives: Present: Masegian, Monday, Lee, Yang, Higgins Absent: None	

II. Land Acknowledgement:
The land acknowledgement is a formal statement that recognizes the history and legacy of colonialism that has impacted our Indigenous peoples, their traditional territories, and their practices. It is a simple and powerful way of showing respect and a step towards correcting the stories and practices that have erased our Indigenous people's history and culture and it is a step towards inviting and honoring the truth. Senator Wei-Chien Lee read the Land Acknowledgement.

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

IV. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Mathur announced the meeting would be recorded for the purpose of preparing the minutes. Only the Senate Chair and Senate Administrator will have access. Please keep yourself muted unless speaking. Only Senators may speak and vote in the Senate meetings. Roll call will be taken by the Senate Administrator using the participant list, so be sure your full name shows. Please type “SL” to speak to a resolution in the chat. If you wish to speak to an amendment please type, ”SL Amendment” into the chat. If you have a longer amendment, please type it into the chat and send to Senator Marachi. One correction to agenda, AS1807 has an incorrect title. The title should be, “Amendment D to University Policy S14-5 Modification of Guidelines for General Education (GE), American Institutions (AI), and the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR).”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

B. From the President:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Questions:
Q: Question regarding the student union, auxiliary budgets, and the operating agreement that needs to be signed by June 30th. Timing, what happens if the budget is not signed by June 30th?
A: [President] Those conversations are taking place and we're working and will be working with the teams to move forward. It is very much on our radar and it is in process. Patrick do you want to speak to this, then Charlie?
A: [VP Day] Charlie and I just left a meeting about this trying to sort of figure out the pathway to get there. I think we are so far able to move forward on our other auxiliaries. We want to make sure that we are able to move this forward in time so that they can do what they need to do. That is our goal to be able to wrap that up so we all close out the year together.

Q: If and when there is a vaccination requirement, will there be a path for those who need an exemption?
A: [President] We have that already. There will be a process through UP for faculty. For students, perhaps through the health center. There are many reasons that people need an exemption, so we will be sure that there is a process.

V. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:
EC Minutes of March 15, 2021 – No questions
EC Minutes of April 5, 2021 – No questions

B. Consent Calendar: None

C. Executive Committee Action Items: None

VI. Unfinished Business: None

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

A. Instruction and Student Affairs (I&SA):
Senator Sullivan-Green presented ***AS 1814, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy F20-1, Adding Classes After***

Advance Registration (Final Reading). Due to errors in the previous version of the revised policy, we elected to pull the policy back, make corrections, and bring back to the Senate for vote. Senator Sullivan-Green presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change "Undergraduate Studies" to "Undergraduate Education" in line 31. **The Senate voted and AS 1814 passed as amended (45-0-1).**
Questions:
Q: If this is about graduate students, why are graduating seniors included in the discussion?
A: This is the full policy language to provide more clarity as we to what we are changing. We just made the changes for graduating graduate students and then there was the one correction on line 37, using the more formal language instead of 'add period' using 'advance registration.'

Senator Sullivan-Green presented ***AS 1815, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy F20-2, Grading Changes to Support Maximum Flexibility for SJSU Students During the Prolonged COVID-19 Pandemic (Final Reading).*** Context to new version. Original amendment removed reference to Spring 2021, and added language that converts WU to NC. President Papazian returned the policy to request to removal of language referencing Summer 2021. **The Senate voted and AS 1815 passed as written (41-2-1).**
Questions:
Q: After students graduate their transcript is locked. What is the impact of this retroactive winter inclusion on those grades for students who have actually graduated? Or does that fall into the language of "legally permissible"?
A: I believe that falls into the word legally permissible. I will say that Marion Yao is part of our committee and did not raise this as an issue when we were discussing it either at the beginning of the semester or more recently.
Q: The registrar's website still has the old language up saying that for spring 21, WU grades will be changed to a W. Will the registrar's office or AARS be extra lenient with requests for late withdrawals to accommodate current communication with students?
A: In the original policy, there are still the statements about maximum accommodation when it comes to withdrawals. AARS and the registrar's office will still be operating under those expectations.
C: Typically, AARS does work with individual students to meet their individual needs. In terms of ensuring that they get good advising and making sure that they are as lenient as they are able to be within the confines of the university policy and the executive orders from the Chancellor's Office.
Q: Why was winter acceptable to be included in this policy, when winter is presumably on the same basis as summer?

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

B. Professional Standards (PS):

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

C: I just wanted to add my voice to Senator Peter’s very eloquent expression of why this is so critical and I want to thank him for his work and the committee for its work, Professional Standards. I can't think of a more important issue in Higher Education generally and to SJSU specifically. It and issues of tenure, when you're also coming under fire, are absolutely fundamental to the functioning of a healthy operation of any university and the ability of the professoriate to do their jobs with a minimum of interference and maximum of protection. I just think this is what a university is all about, so I wanted to add my voice to that.
C: Thank you Senator Peter and the Professional Standards committee. I greatly appreciate this coming forward. Being an institution that is basically established to promote intellectual pursuits this statement of having freedom of expression and freedom of debate is critical to what we do in everyday with our students. Having this suppressed would be a critical loss of the real essence of academia, so I strongly encourage support of this resolution.
C: Thank you, Senator Peter, and I appreciate Professional Standards and what you're trying to do here in terms of the supporting academic freedom. I’m speaking as somebody who is totally in support of academic freedom but I’m also concerned about the timing of this resolution and signing on and support of this letter. Only because, as I would say, from the position of CDO most of the complaints that come into my office are about the suppression of academic freedom and are from the other side for those who want to speak against diversity, speak against equity, and speak against our pursuit of systemic racism. My concern is about the practical impact of this resolution. I’m in support of academic freedom, I want to make that very clear, but I’m concerned in this political climate of putting out something like this at this at this time. We do have Time, Place and Manner. We do support academic freedom on campus and so again I’m not saying that we shouldn't support this, I just want people to think carefully about the impact on our entire community and how different parties will interpret the putting out of this statement. I am just concerned

about the timing and how this can be weaponized or used to hurt the very people you're trying to protect.
C: Academic freedom has been abused by any number of people for their own purposes, isn't that what this statement actually says? We need to be prepared to listen to wrongheaded arguments, from time to time, it doesn't mean we're excused from battling those arguments. I will also point out, if it's influential to anyone, that when we debated this resolution, Dr. Patience Bryant, Director of Black/ African American Equity was sitting with the Professional Standards committee. She endorsed the resolution and told us that if she had a vote, she would vote for it. I do think that there are individuals who are sensitive to these concerns, who nevertheless support a full throated endorsement of academic freedom.
C: I too would like to respond to the CDO and what she shared with us about the attacks on her office. Actually, to me, that demonstrates the importance of us passing this resolution and the Chicago principles. At the same time, if there are specific clauses in the Chicago statement that she thinks are more susceptible to use her words 'being weaponized' then that's definitely something that we can look at. We do not necessarily have to adopt the statement in total, if there are specific concerning clauses in it.
C: As somebody who has been involved with the National Association for Chicana and Chicano Studies, we have been fighting several cases of death threats against several of our faculty who have been videotaped by right wing students. Individuals who have published their families and their children names and who have had very horrible experiences. This makes me believe that this resolution is incredibly important even at the risk of giving anybody the opportunity to say that we need to be fair in our discussion of freedom of expression. I think it is more important to protect those people who are being attacked with this kind of statement. I strongly support this resolution.
C: I am in favor of this resolution, but I wanted to confirm what the CDO, and I also in my office have seen, that freedom of expression can be used as a weapon against the principles that we are ostensibly trying to protect. While I feel like I do not need to remind my fellow senators and colleagues, it's worth saying out loud that part of being in the business of academia, is that we remember that we also need to address the can of worms that we open when we do speak of academic freedom. I would encourage our body to remember that just passing a resolution expressing freedom of expression also entails the work of making sure that we address some of the harm that may come to our students and our communities.
C: I am curious as to why only 81 universities have endorsed this statement since 2014 and I wonder if it speaks to the concerns that the CDO has brought up and whether or not we need to endorse this statement, while maybe instead reviewing our own language and places and making sure we're reinforcing what we have written down that might

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

C. Organization and Government (O&G):
Senator Sasikumar presented ***AS 1816, Policy Recommendation, Amendment C to University Policy S17-11, Revisions to Organization of the Program Planning Process at SJSU (Final Reading)***. Senator Sasikumar outlined the changes in the Provost's office that lead to inclusion of the new Vice Provost of Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Analytics on this committee, providing a specific seat to the new college of Graduate Studies, and fixing an error of 'or designee' for the Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education. **The Senate voted and AS 1816 passed as written (42-0-2).**
Questions:
Q: Do I read this correctly, that III.B.2 is the designee and not the individual or their designee? Or is the individual already on this committee?
A: The Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education has been serving, that is correct. But when the policy was written the word "or" was inadvertently omitted.

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

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

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

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

Questions:

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

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

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

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

where the students must take any courses in multiple departments. We believe that will still work for our campus because of what we call GE studies on our campus is actually upper-division GE. Our Area S courses are basically upper-division area D, so the students would still be able to meet those criteria of having courses in two different areas.
Q: If we had changes to the guidelines, Area D and Area F when might be the right time to suggest that and make those changes?
A: In this case, because the guidelines are coming forward as an appendix and it's not part of the actual policy recommendation, there would be no more changes to the guidelines at this point. You can make changes to the policy by making changes to the resolved clauses.
Q: Old language needs to be changed. We barely see international students, I don't even know if we have sections for international students, separate from everyone else. We do have students in all our classes who are multilingual speakers, but we don't have special sections with “foreign” students?
A: This is very, very old language and so what we have done for the instructor qualifications is that this language matches the instruction qualifications for all the other GE areas. C&R actually does agree with you that this should be revised. We have tabled this issue to take it up in the fall. I believe the committee is going to strike a lot of this language and work on editing a lot of this language, especially in the instructor qualifications area.
C: I understand the importance of academic degrees in academia as a I have PhD myself, this is in no way denigrating a doctoral degree, but the implication here is that a doctorate makes a person a superior teacher. This is not the case, and when you look at the reality on the ground, the vast majority of GE classes are taught by lecturer faculty. Many of whom do not have a doctorate degree and so to have a requirement like that I think is very insulting and it does faculty a disservice but I will send you the language later Senator White.
C: Thank you to the C&R committee. Special thank you to our Ethnic Studies faculty experts, particularly those on the Area F GRP.

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

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

VIII. Special Committee Reports:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Q: Would you be willing to share this presentation with the Senate?
A: Absolutely, be happy to.

Q: Many years ago, as part of a different campaign, there was a push of having faculty and staff directly donating, $5 a month. Is this a thing or was this part of someone's pet project?
A: We do have a faculty and staff campaign every year and sometimes with competitions among divisions. Funds from $5 to a million dollars all will count towards our campaign, we do hope to encourage and have robust engagement in that way. If you feel like you can and are able to contribute back to campus but again it's completely voluntary, San Diego State they had really, really amazing robust participation from their faculty and staff during their last campaign and it made a significant difference. It's typically run by our annual fund, and I think that you've seen an email probably from Coleetta a couple of months ago with this, the same message so it's something that will continue to do.
A: [VP Davis] It does tend to be part of any given campaign, you know my thinking about it is this, and this is whether it's for faculty staff, or community members. Philanthropy is about the opportunity to invest in something that you care about, and so, for me, our work in fundraising is really about giving people the opportunity to contribute philanthropically if they if that's something that they care deeply about. It is why it is so important to be sure that we are donor-centric. We take a look at what the campus needs. You don't want to just say that you raised the money. You are bringing in funds for things you only need the money for; taking a look at what the campus needs then sort of know marrying that to a person's interests and things they feel passionate about. To have a faculty and staff fundraising campaign, to make that part of the campaign, whether you're in this formalized structured around campaigns or just annually, it is about giving people the opportunity to support. That is a wonderful thing and it is something we want to continue.

Time Certain: 4:00 p.m., ULB Report to Senate:
Emily Chan, Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship, Martin Luther King Jr. Library

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We were able to distribute technology, prototyping materials, CSU plus, and SJSU holds materials through our locker service. That locker service did help us to distribute materials in a safe manner and meet the quarantine requirements at the time. We were also able to fulfill faculty's RSCA requests during December through February 2021 when things kind of shut down again. We were able to ship materials to faculty directly. All16 requests that we received, you know all of those faculty members were contacted and those materials were acquired.

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

Questions:
Q: Thank you for the chat. That has been an amazing support during this whole pandemic, but I did want to know about the open access. Typically open access articles do have faculty supporting it with fees and I was wondering what is happening with the Elsevier publications?
A: Great question. During this time period, all of those article publishing charges (APCs) that would normally go to the faculty member to pay if they wanted to opt for open access those are all being waived. During this time period, anyone who submits to an eligible Elsevier title will have those APCs waived as long as you submit during the calendar year. It doesn't matter when it's accepted or anything like that, as long as you submit during this calendar year.

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

articles had been made open access, if you multiply that by like the $3,000 charge that each article would be valued at, that is a value of $654,000 to the CSU. So, it's completely free for this pilot period and we're hoping that the Chancellor's Office will continue to pursue these types of transformative agreements. Instead of us paying necessarily for reading rights. We're hoping to use more of our dollars towards allocating them towards publishing rights. And that's what the UC has done recently with Elsevier.
Q: I had a question regarding e-books has there been any thoughts or conversations about multi-access e-books for students?
A: In terms of whenever we acquire e-books, we always try to acquire the concurrency type that is unlimited. If it's available, we try to acquire the unlimited user model for a particular title. If that isn't available for a particular title, then that's when we would look at like three users or one user, but we typically try to get unlimited whenever possible. If you are seeing only a few users that can use a particular title, that's generally a constraint that's placed on that title by the publisher itself. That isn't to say we couldn't try to purchase multiple, like three user licenses, and if that's the case, then I think that's a conversation to have with the liaison librarian. But we generally try to get unlimited access models.

IX. New Business: None

X. State of the University Announcements:

A. Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA):
B. Chief Diversity Officer:
C. CSU Faculty Trustee: Report distributed via the Senate Listserv
D. Statewide Academic Senators:
E. Provost:
F. Associated Students President:
G. Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF):

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

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

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

Absent: None

1. From the Chair:
   The virtual Faculty Service Recognition Event is this week. The week kicks off with videos with the 15 year honorees today and ends on Thursday with the live event. They will also be honoring last year's honorees. Please attend if you can.

   The Honors Convocation is next week and you will be receiving an email about it. This event will be livestreamed on Friday April 23 at 4pm.

   We are in a holding pattern with our website and have been since March 23, 2021. It has been a process. Many department chairs are having a lot of problems with Basecamp Barkley and the confusing messages they have received from them.

   Q: How will we get the materials for Monday's Senate?
   A: We will post on the website, but the Senate Administrator will have to repost anything posted for the meeting after the website is migrated over. We will also send out the packet via email.

   Please send your resolutions for Monday's (April 19. 2021) Senate meeting to the Senate Administrator by Wednesday, April 14, 2021.

   There will be a presentation at the Senate Meeting from the ULB and also an update from University Advancement. All other reports will be done in writing including Student Fairness grievances, Academic Integrity, and Exceptional Admissions.

2. The Executive Committee Agenda was approved (Executive Committee Agenda of 4-12-21, and Executive Committee Minutes of April 5, 2021)(15-0-0).

3. Updates from the Policy Committees:
   a. From the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
      I&SA will bring back the corrected amendment to the Advance Registration policy.

      I&SA has also been working on the syllabus, website, and catalog. We need to make sure these are up-to-date particularly around the student support services and also everything in the catalog affected by policy changes.

      I&SA will probably not be able to finish the grade forgiveness policy this semester and will finish it next semester.

b. From the Professional Standards Committee (PS):
The PS Committee hopes to have three resolutions for the Senate at the April 19, 2021 meeting. The Lecturer Policy has been back and forth with yet more changes. There are some changes we weren't willing to make. We will see if there are changes on the floor of the Senate. We are putting the final touches on the Sense of the Senate Resolution on RTP equity reform. We also hope to have a Sense of the Senate Resolution endorsing the Chicago Academic Freedom Statement for the Senate meeting.

We will probably spend our last two meetings going through department guidelines. We do have one issue. The policy we passed to change the name in all policies where it references either the Provost or Faculty Affairs is now mute because there is no longer a Faculty Affairs Office. It is now Faculty Success. We are not quite sure what to do with this. Perhaps we should say all of them should be designated "Provost or designee".

Questions:
C: [Provost] It might not be a bad idea.

C: For me, it would be really important to continue to have it be Faculty Affairs and not the Provost. Hopefully, in the future we have another Faculty Affairs Office. This office is essential for faculty. It is the place that faculty go to get expert advice regarding faculty.
A: [Provost] That's what Faculty Success is.
C: Yes and No.
A: [Provost] It is to me and I'm the one telling them what their jobs are.
C: It isn't to me.

C: One of my concerns with the University of Chicago Statement is that my office has received some requests to setup a fund to bring in anti-equity speakers. The argument is that by not funding the other side we are shutting down debate. My office simply isn't going to do this. My concern is that letters like the University of Chicago Statement have been misused to say universities have an obligation to provide balance, debate, and must present the other side. Please consider this. This can create a problem.
A: That has always been the problem with all forms of Academic Freedom. Channel Islands did endorse it so there is another CSU campus that has endorsed it. There are over 100 institutions that have endorsed it all over the U.S. However, you are right. I've heard some of the same things. That is why we need people to know a lot more about Academic Freedom.

Q: Would you consider advocating in the Sense of the Senate Resolution for the Senate to host an Academic Freedom Forum? We already do have a resolution that requires an Academic Freedom Forum each year, but this seems like a good time to enforce that.
A: The Board of Academic Freedom did endorse this statement last Fall. It might be good to inject some energy into that organization and get it to do what it should be doing. Yes, as we return to campus it would be a great time to talk about this.

C: Two retreats ago the Chair of the Board of Academic Freedom presented at the retreat. As the incoming Senate Chair, I'd be happy to work on that.

c. From the Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
We will be bringing two policy recommendations to the Senate on April 19, 2021. The first will be on Areas D and F of the GE Guidelines, and the other recommendation is to adopt new Program Learning Outcomes. These will be coming forward as first readings.

d. From the Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
O&G will be bringing two resolutions to the Senate on April 19, 2021. The first resolution will formalize the addition of two staff members to the university library dean search committee. The second resolution changes the membership of the Program Planning Committee.

Questions:
Q: Related to the second resolution, will that be coming as a Senate Management Resolution or a Policy Recommendation.
A: Senate Management Resolution. [Note: Upon further review it was discovered that the original document that established the committee was a policy and therefore any amendments to it must be policy amendments.]

4. From the President:
The biggest thing on our minds right now is the repopulation plan. It is somewhat of a moving target taking into consideration state guidelines, vaccination availability, county health. We still really don't know what August will look like. We are in the midst of all of this. We want to consider the academic program, but also must look at things like air circulation, office space. There are a lot of challenges. These next couple of weeks we will be making some preliminary decisions that we will have to stick with. Inevitably there is no solution that will satisfy everyone. I think we have a good sense of a reasonable timeline. We also must think about when we come back what events can be in person? What about theatrical and student events? How will we make those decisions? Fall will be a transition semester.

There is movement nationally from campuses towards requiring vaccines. Even the UC is considering it. However, we will see where that goes. If we can't require it, what does protecting our faculty, students, and staff look like? This is the other piece of it.

We had a series of meetings with legislative folks. We are lucky to have an extraordinary delegation. We talked about our priorities for the students and the campus. We are pushing for the infrastructure bill.

Questions:
C: I know many chairs are talking about this. Is there anything in the way of pay raises for our office administrative personnel? Most of our admins have been working round the clock for over a year and they deserve it. They don't get paid enough as it is.

C: I would like to echo the previous comment about raises for our admins. Also, I would like to bring up that many of the admins have expressed real interest in having more flexibility on the job such as being able to work from home all or part of the time. They have proven they can do this successfully.
A: Thank you both.

5. Special Report on the Fall 2020 Faculty Survey
   Dr. Magdalena Barrera and Dr. Deanna Fassett presented the results of the Fall 2020 Faculty Survey. The Fall 2020 Faculty Survey is meant to be a counterpart to the Spring 2020 Student Success Survey. The team who put together the questions included representatives from across Academic Affairs and staff from the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.

   The questions focused on faculty experiences during the pandemic including the transition to online teaching and included key questions such as caregiving responsibilities of faculty during the pandemic. We collected responses from November 2020 through January 2021. We had a response rate of 37% or 714 faculty members. The respondents matched the faculty population of SJSU as a whole. In the faculty population women make up 53%, and in the survey population women made up 54%. As far as ethnicities, the survey population pretty much matched the SJSU population, except for an underrepresentation of the Asian population by 7%. We used some different ethnic identifiers than in the faculty population so that may account for some of the difference.

   The first set of questions had to do with well-being and access to resources. Interestingly enough, about 24% of faculty reported doing very well. However, 20% reported only doing slightly well or not well as all. We see this as being two ends of the spectrum. Faculty are either doing very well or not well at all. Forty percent of faculty reported that working from home was going very or extremely well. Eighteen percent reported it was not going well. Almost all faculty reported having access to the computer equipment and the access that they need. However, slightly fewer had the physical space to do their work. Also, only 80% had a quiet environment to support their work.

   A range of 37% to 48% were not aware of sites such as Teach Anywhere, Teaching and Learning, and Discover SJSU. This shows there is an opportunity for an information campaign. They primarily use e-Campus, IT, and Center for Faculty Development (CFD) programs. The offices and programs that faculty were least aware of included online Counseling Services, Employee Assistance Program (EAP), equipment loan programs, and Coronavirus programs.

   Cami Johnson did a qualitative analysis of our data and found that faculty rank is the greatest predictor of well-being. This ranked higher than gender, race, or ethnicity. Tenure-track faculty reported the lowest level of well-being. Even though lecturers may have greater economic instabilities, they tend to have more family in the area. Whereas, tenure-track faculty may be new to the area and not have the same support systems around them such as for child care. This is a very interesting finding moving forward.

   Fifty-six percent of faculty reported having at least one care-giving responsibility. Half of those folks had no paid or unpaid help with caregiving. Seventy-nine percent of faculty with school-age children reported that their children were attending school online in Fall 2020. Forty-five percent of faculty reported that their children's online school activities and forty-nine percent of faculty reported that their children's social and emotional well-being were negatively impacting their work activities.

In terms of communication from the university, most faculty reported high satisfaction with communications from department chairs and directors, colleagues, and e-campus. Faculty reported less satisfaction with the bookstore, university personnel, and university administration.

Some of the factors that affected effectiveness in this survey included caregiving responsibilities (49%), mental health and wellness (55%), and lack of contact with colleagues (64%). More than one in five faculty reported being extremely worried about the lasting impacts of COVID-19 on their careers. Lecturers were very worried about job security due to budget cuts and low enrollment. Both tenure and tenure/track respondents reported concerns about their Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA) being stalled and that this would affect their career. There were further concerns about the ripple effects of the pandemic on their ability to reach full professor down the road. Both lecturers and tenure/tenure-track faculty reported concerns about negative SOTES from students who are also struggling and how that would affect them down the road. Faculty stated they did not want to be penalized for having to pivot to a teaching method that is completely the opposite from how they normally teach their classes. Faculty asked how were they going to get evaluators to understand the real impacts of COVID-19?

Forty-seven percent of faculty were teaching synchronously online. Eighteen percent were teaching asynchronously, and twenty-seven percent were teaching bichronously.

Faculty report the greatest satisfaction with Zoom session security. Faculty communication with students is robust. Faculty were the least satisfied with their ability to preserve and nurture Academic Integrity.

Fifty-nine percent of faculty preferred a single teaching modality. Forty percent of faculty preferred a mix. We could imagine hybrid instruction continuing post pandemic in a more robust way. Some of the challenges encountered by faculty include a lack of connection with their students, difficulty engaging their students, and struggling to read the room. There were also some issues with cheating in remote and online classes.

There were some positive aspects to the pandemic. Faculty were able to work from home. They did not have to commute. Also, they did not did not have to search for parking. There were also some educational benefits such as being able to put a name with a student's face and being able to record the class and make it available to students. Faculty reported personal growth in using technology to meet the needs of students.

For the summer cohort, more than half had never taught an online class before. Faculty who participated in the summer cohort felt more prepared and used more technology such as online breakout rooms and online discussion boards.

Some recommendations that have come out of this survey include working groups to address BIPOC faculty concerns about workload and Retention-Tenure-Promotion (RTP). Doing an audit of faculty service commitments with a focus on equity. Continue offering tenure-track extensions for tenure-track faculty, which is already in the works. Also, continuing to look at how we support faculty after the pandemic given the long-term effects of COVID-19. We need to engage chairs and deans in communication campaigns. Faculty

pay more attention to communication from the chairs and deans. We will offer a faculty development program that builds on last summer's program and offers best practices for student success. We also need to look at long term what resources do we need to create and for whom. Finally, what additional information do we need to collect on behalf of faculty.

Questions:
C: A lot of the time I had to go to the Senate to get information that should have been given to the department chairs to share with the faculty. Also, the administration should tell chairs how to appropriately share that information with the faculty. This communication could be done much more appropriately.
A: Thanks for the observations. Deanna and I are working on integrating a Canvas course that has tools and best practices for department chairs.

Q: To what extent is this unusual because of COVID as opposed to being what happens in academia normally as far as the challenges faced by tenure-track faculty? Also, I believe this campus has done a terrible job of supporting working parents. There is inattention to scheduling issues for parents and no childcare on campus, how can the campus do a better job of supporting faculty and staff moving forward?
A: Our campus is in a moment of transition, and this is a good time to start looking at new ways of doing things. This is especially true of things that have been emphasized even more during COVID-19, such as childcare issues and flexible schedules.
C: The highest rank of the faculty who have attended the employee connection meetings has been the Assistant Faculty. These are the faculty who have just moved into the area and haven't had a chance to make connections.

C: I've had my chair come to me because of my role on the Senate for information and there is often conflicting information that goes out. I think the idea of improved communication is great and a Canvas repository of tools and resources is also useful, but we do still primarily communicate through email. However, the Canvas course on RTP has been very useful to me and I've went back to that course many times.

C: It may also have been that there was a subset of faculty who were so overwhelmed that they did not respond to the survey. They may be struggling. Please keep that in mind.
A: Absolutely. It was really interesting because there were some folks who expressed a lot of cynicism about what was going to be done with the results.

C: There is a lot of ambiguity around the category of service for our tenure-track faculty. The tenure-track faculty are being asked to provide more and more service to students while they themselves are going through the pandemic, but this is service that is not recognized by university administration. I did not see many questions around service on the survey. And faculty were not talking about service in terms of committees and faculty coordination as a problem. Also, we need some guidelines for how to teach in the Zoom environment and what you can and cannot do. Things such as how to talk to students about appropriate Zoom backgrounds, can you require students to be on camera (no), some basic guidelines about teaching in Zoom
A: Agree, that is something we can definitely work on.

Q: When will this go out to the full campus?
A: The report should be wrapped up in a week and then it will be put on the Institutional Research website very soon.

6. University Updates:
   a. CSU Statewide Senate:
      There are three resolutions before the CSU Statewide Senate related to what things will look like after COVID and the long-term effects.

      Much of our work has been focused on implementing the Ethnic Studies Graduation requirement. We have also been moving into discussions about the community colleges and courses that could be used according to the articulation agreement and so forth. There are a few concerns about how they are addressing this. For instance, we are being told that community college faculty are being told to take one graduate class in Ethnic Studies to qualify them as experts.

      There are budget and legislative support issues that the ASCSU are also considering.

   b. Vice President of Administration and Finance (VPAF):
      One of the issues we are facing is parking. When we all return, we will be facing more people driving to campus than ever. People will not want to ride the trains or buses. We did just open up another 1,500 parking spaces at South Campus. We are looking at some open air trams to get people from South Campus to Campus quickly. We are working with the city to see if they can help with some spots. Everything we have been pushing as being environmentally friendly, people are not going to want to do because of COVID.

      Question:
      Q: Not everyone will be returning in the fall, as far as we can tell there will still be online classes right?
      A: According to the Governor, things could get accelerated. I think our students want to be back on campus, and they need to be back on campus. There will be some faculty still teaching remotely. However, if we have to be 3 feet apart, and not 6 feet apart, in Fall then we will need the parking.

      Q: I'd like to hear more about the tram?
      A: We are looking at having trams with open sides that are covered. They would run down 7th up 10th to 11th Street and make a loop with South Campus.

      Q: Would you consider extending the loop to include the Caltrain Station?
      A: It's possible. If we have 2,300 people parking down on South Campus, we have to take care of that first. The city does have the Rapid Transit 500 that goes from Diridon to campus. We are looking at that and trying to balance it.

      Q: The 4th Street parking above Flames offers discounts to students.
      A: The problem with the 4th Street garage above Flames is the city refuses to sell spots on Wednesdays. They have rotary on Wednesdays for an hour a day. Therefore, you

can't sell weekly passes. There are about 200 people who attend the rotary meetings. It is the largest attended meeting in downtown San José.
A: We met with some folks who are trying to get one fee whether you are on Bart, or VTA. That is complicated because there are 28 transportation agencies in downtown. That's ridiculous. Other cities have figured it out. We will figure it out.

Q: I'm a bus user and public transportation user and I think it is one of the best investments a city can make. Many other countries have really good public transportation systems, especially France. With the change in the federal administration, might there be greater investment in public transportation for the future?
A: Everyone will say they want to be more sustainable, but people have a real hard time getting out of their cars. What you do then is raise the rates for parking on and near campus. We aren't able to do that right now. It is difficult to change people's mindset about driving. Associated Students does a great job getting us bus passes, other transportation to campus. We are looking at how to get people from Morgan Hill and Gilroy to campus. Right now you are on a bus crawling up 101. The express bus only runs about 1 ½ hours in the morning. We defeat ourselves when we don't have enough people using public transportation.
C: There are many people who can't afford to live near campus due to the cost of living near campus.
C: I drove to campus last week and I was amazed at how much traffic there was and that is with many people still working from home. I think when faculty and staff start coming back to campus they may migrate back to public transportation just because of the traffic.
A: I would get on Bart in a heartbeat. I live in Fremont. However, it is cheaper for me to park on campus, than have to pay $6 each way to campus. You have to have affordable transportation.
C: As you mentioned $12 a day for our students is impossibly expensive. We need to do a better job of this.

7. The meeting adjourned at 1:44 p.m.

These minutes were taken by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on April 12, 2021 and transcribed on April 23, 2021. The minutes were reviewed and edited by Chair Mathur on April 23, 2021. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on April 26, 2021.

Executive Committee Minutes
April 26, 2021
via Zoom, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

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

Absent: None

1. The Executive Committee minutes of April 12, 2021 were approved (14-0-0).

2. There was no dissent to the consent calendar of April 26, 2021.

3. From the Chair:
   Kudos to Jessica Larsen for her work on the Honors Convocation. It was a heartwarming event. Over 700 people were livestreaming the event on YouTube.

4. Committee deliberations for 2021-2022:
   The committee discussed faculty nominees for the Accreditation Review Committee (ARC) and the Institutional Review Board (IRB). A nominee cannot serve more than two terms on the IRB according to policy. The only nominee has already served two terms. The committee discussed the need for qualified personnel and the policy prohibits keeping qualified people on the committee when no one else wants to apply. The committee debated whether the Executive Committee should consider suspending the policy to allow for the appointment. Chair Mathur noted that it was dangerous for a small group to set a precedent about committee placement. A member noted that the IRB policy was passed in 2018 and there was no grandfather clause so the nominee had technically only served one term. The committee decided that for this time without a grandfather clause in the policy, this individual can be appointed as a second term. Chair Mathur will then prepare a referral on the behalf of the Executive Committee to O&G to review the term limit for this committee for the fall. A member called the question. The committee voted and the question was called (13-1-0). The committee voted and the motion carried (14-0-0).

5. Chair Mathur introduced Vice Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Analytics, Junelyn Peeples and Associate CIO from Enterprise Solutions, Alex Wong. The Executive Committee and Senate Administrator introduced themselves. Dr. Peeples and Mr. Wong gave a presentation on the Campus Data Warehouse (CDW).

   Purpose: The CDW offers several benefits for rudimentary and well-versed users of data and reporting systems.

   Benefits: The CDW provides student-level data to appropriate stakeholders in a secure and user-friendly environment. The CDW will standardize data reporting through a centralized data system. Right now there are multiple data systems on campus and some of these systems are not well coordinated.

   Goals and Objectives: Build a comprehensive Campus Data Warehouse. Provide an integrated and consolidated data repository that catalogs and validates all data elements.

Objectives: Accurate data that is accessible and user-friendly that will provide users a self-service analytic tool to query data that offers visualization techniques. To establish a data governance policy to improve data security, use, and literacy. It will support Transformation 2030 and other divisional initiatives. Develop a campus committee to support the Data Governance policy development and initiatives.

Phase I – Build a Central Data Repository System.
Phase II – Develop a Data Governance Model.
Phase III – Develop role-based security access for reporting tools.

Questions:
Q: Who is going to establish the data governance policy? Typically, 'policy' has a specific meaning on our campus to refer to 'university policy.' Who is going to be able to participate in this committee or group that will focus on data governance?
A: What I'm doing now is reaching out to get names. We haven't developed that group yet. We want to make sure we include all the appropriate stakeholders and that we are aligned with all current policies and Transformation 2030.

Q: It sounds like you are building a data warehouse and not tapping into one, right?
A: Yes.
Q: There have been some concerns about metadata. Like around Canvas. Are there plans to bring in the metadata, or will there be full transparency about what would be done?
A: We really haven't decided yet whether we are going to take Canvas data into the CDW and who will have access. We also need to look at how the metadata is being populated. Is it being manually inputted one-by-one or is it being electronically generated? We haven't gotten there yet, but we will be very transparent.

C: We have an existing policy on information privacy that I suggest you read. It is University Policy F97-7. We tried to update it, but the President vetoed it. This is why I posted the difference between a Presidential Directive and University Policy in the chat. It really is important that we know who is making the policy regarding information privacy.
A: That is very helpful. Thank you.

6. From the President:
   Kudos to the faculty and staff involved in the Honors Convocation. Kudos to our students who have done extraordinary work over a very difficult time. The President noted that over 4,000 students have signed up for the on campus graduation activities. It is important to them and their families to have these in-person events.

   Junelyn Peeples and Alex Wong are amazing additions to the campus. Alex is already fully engaged and has only been here a few weeks. The CDW will reduce lots of confusion. We spend a lot of time trying to reconcile data that doesn't seem to match.

   Questions:
   Q: I've been getting pressure regarding your signing Amendment A to F20-2, is there a problem with it?

A: No, I wanted to wait until the Provost reviewed it and gave the go ahead. I'll read through it again after this meeting and it should be signed today. There are two other amendments as well. My plan is to get these all done today.
Q: This issue surfaced in the BAC meeting, this idea of SJSU online. The way it surfaced is that it was already a done deal and this is what we are doing. I'd like to get an update on this?
A: [President] This is geared toward the adult learners with some college courses completed, but no degree. This is a really important population. These are people where the complications of life have interfered with completion of their degree. They are also people who are probably working and caregivers. Online learning allows us to meet them where they are. Otherwise, they will have to go to the private and for-profits.
A: [Provost] We have two degree completion programs that were approved. They are launching this fall and are fully online. The first program is in Information Science. This program had over 100 applicants with little advertising, and 70 of those applicants were admitted using the same admitting criteria for the main campus. The second program is in Interdisciplinary Studies coming out of the College of Education. The College of Education is putting some Tower dollars behind it for scholarships for people coming out of community colleges. In answer to the question about SJSU Online as a brand, we aren't there yet. We haven't really discussed this. We are trying to see if there is strong interest in developing programs. It is coming from non-state money. The CSU as a whole is definitely exploring this. It is my opinion that there are too many students going to for-profit schools that we could serve for a reasonable price.
A: [President] There is a discussion in Sacramento about reforming the Cal Grant. The CSU has some questions and now they are working with a team. One of the elements is to expand it to adult learners. The idea is to expand financial aid to adult learners. This serves a need in California and is a win for students. VP Day is the CSU Representative on the Student Aid Commission.
A: [VP Day] There has been a lot of discussion and a real focus on adult learners. It is clear adult learners are not being served in the state. The new equity framework in the state will include adult learners. We, and I mean all secondary institutions, will be looking at our role serving adult learners.
A: [Provost] Cal Bright's failure should not have been a surprise to anybody. That was $100 million flushed down the toilet by the state that could have been given to standing institutions that could have done this work much better and much more directly for students. This is just a sign that if we don't turn the corner and start to think about these unique populations and how to connect to them, it flies in the face of our mission. We could have an argument about state support, but you know how hard it is to get enrollment funding to increase access. We need to think about other models while we are waiting for the state to get its act together. However, it will be dependent on people wanting to do this.

Q: Has there been a market analysis that has been done about the sustainability of these programs and for SJSU Online overall?
A: There is a debate about whether national institutions will be national or not. What data suggests is that students in these programs live within 50 to 100 miles of their institution. A brand still matters. In our own community what we are seeing is a decline in frosh applications. The market has been softening for three years. There are almost one quarter million students who leave the state to get degrees in other places online. The question you ask is our total enrollment budget, will we have enough frosh and where will our transfer

students come from? What we know is that students are looking for more flexibility to get degrees. They can't travel to them and will look anywhere they can. In the state of California, especially the Black population, there is an intensity of using the for-profit institutions. We are ethnically challenged by not providing a place for these students? What do we want to be? Are we looking to be a 100,000 student institution, or are we looking to provide access for another 3,000 or 4,000 additional students? I think we are the latter. We are trying to provide access where there is none. That market has been there for some time. We need to not make this about revenue. We need to make it stay focused on access. My personal belief is that the CSU could handle another 100,000 students.

Q: Do you see the students as students or do you see the students as consumers?
A: [Provost] I've always seen them as students. The truth is they are also consumers. I would love for the state of California to provide free education for all students in higher education. But, there is a business model that does go with it.
A: [President] I don't like talking about students as consumers, but the reality is we do have a business side to the institution. We must have a business side in order to do the academic side with quality. Students want to connect with a campus they know. We know the quality of our faculty. People want jobs and a better life for themselves and their children. This is a way for us to support them.

Q: Can the President respond to the article in the Mercury News about the allegations of sexual misconduct in Athletics? It appears to me your administration reopened the investigation, but the champion for the students was ignored and bullied by Athletics and there hasn't been a change in management. What can be noted about the retaliation allegations within Athletics?
A: We want to do right by the women and give them a voice. There is lots we cannot say. We have very clear policies on retaliation. There have been three Athletics Directors since these allegations. Also, allegations are not proof. All processes have to play out before anything is done. We want to have an entirely independent investigation. The President is committed to taking the appropriate action when the investigation is completed. We are trying to be as accurate as possible. It is not our place to editorialize. The President is as frustrated that this issue wasn't resolved in 2009/2010. We will find out what happened and share whatever we can. The President does not make decisions based on allegations, but on evidence. She has an obligation to ensure due process on both sides.

7. Senator Marachi made a motion to extend the meeting by 10 minutes to finish the committee deliberations. The motion was seconded. The committee voted and the motion passed (13-1-0).

8. The committee discussed and selected nominees for the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Committee (ADAPC) and the Student Success Committee.

9. From the AS President:
   AS Awards will be presented in May.

   AS will host its first Spartan Talks with Dr. Williams.

10. From the CDO:

In response to the Sense of the Senate Resolution passed by the Academic Senate, a Native American Taskforce is being put together and the CDO is assisting the steering committee.

11. From the CSU Statewide Representative:
    The CSU training mentioned in the chat will take place on May 26, 2021. I have to get clarity on whether anyone can attend. They said it was open to chairs.

12. The meeting adjourned at 1:48 p.m.

These minutes were taken by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on April 26, 2021 and transcribed on April 30, 2021. The minutes were reviewed and edited by Chair Mathur on April 30, 2021. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on May 3, 2021.

SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY
Academic Senate
Instruction and Student Affairs Committee **AS 1818**
May 10, 2021
Final Reading

POLICY RECOMMENDATION
Undergraduate Advising

Rescinds: University Policy S89-10

Whereas: Advising of students is critical to their academic success at SJSU, and

Whereas: Advising affects a student's selection of a degree program, retention in their chosen program, and progress towards a timely graduation, and

Whereas: One of the most important relationships between students and advisors, whether faculty or staff advisors, is that which develops during the cooperative planning of their academic degree program, and this relationship can have far reaching consequences in student success beyond academics, and

Whereas: Over 30 years has passed since the approval of S89-10: Undergraduate Academic Advisement; Advising. Many of the challenges noted then were also identified by the NACADA report shared with the greater campus community in August, 2019 [1]. These include inaccessibility of advisors, inconsistency in the quality of advising, and a lack of a cohesive advising strategy, and

Whereas: The NACADA report also listed the following as challenges of the advising structure at SJSU during their visit in April 2019:

- *Student dissatisfaction with advising structure and delivery*
- *Advising structures and processes are fragmented and confusing for students*
- *Lack of a standard definition of academic advising at SJSU; lack of clearly articulated definition, mission, goal statements*
- *Lack of a comprehensive training program*
- *Key administrative advising leadership position recently eliminated*
- *Lack of trust from the advising community toward SJSU leadership*
- *General lack of trust between central advising office and college success centers; role of centralized vs. departmental advising is not clear*
- *Lack of university-wide academics-focused communication plan*

[1] NACADA Consultants SJSU Report Final 2019

- *Orientation is not academically-focused*
- *Inconsistent use of, and access to, technology, [2]*and

Whereas: Since the report was published in August 2019, the university has:

- Established an Academic Advising Steering Committee with stakeholders from across the campus advising community
- Created Undergraduate Academic Advising Vision, Mission, & Core Values, as well as SJSU Advisor and Student Expectations and Responsibilities statements
- Held regular Advising Summits to provide opportunities for professional development and discussion of advising topics for the campus advising community
- Developed an online onboarding course for new advisors, and an online Spartan Advisors Professional Development Academy
- Conducted surveys of advisors and students to gather feedback on advising at SJSU [3], and

Whereas: The vision states that students "*proactively engage[ing] with academic advisors on their journey [4],* and

Whereas: A comprehensive advising plan requires crucial engagement of both staff and faculty advisors, and

Whereas: University Policy S15-8: Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and Standards [5] specifically states that the Service Category must include "*...advising, mentoring, and participating in activities to enhance student success that are not subsumed in teaching or the primary academic assignment,*" and

Whereas: Some lecturer faculty may assume advising responsibilities as part of their work assignment, which counts as service to the university in periodic evaluations and range elevation, therefore be it

Resolved: That S89-10 be rescinded and replaced with the following.

[2] See Appendix A for full executive summary from the NACADA Consultants SJSU Report Final 2019
[3] https://www.sjsu.edu/advising/faculty_staff/
[4] SJSU Academic Advising Vision, Mission & Values
[5] https://www.sjsu.edu/senate/docs/S15-8.pdf

Policy Recommendation
Undergraduate Advising

SJSU shall have a comprehensive advising structure that is consistent and equitable for all students, regardless of their major or academic standing.

All forms of advising shall take place in a supportive environment which is sensitive to the needs of a diverse student population.

All students should be active agents in constructing and achieving their academic, career, and personal goals.

Advising at SJSU encompasses a wide range of services to support students in the following academic and non-academic areas: Major/minor Advising, General Education Advising, Career Advising, and Holistic Support Services.

The coordination, delivery, and evaluation of advising shall be a shared responsibility of the SJSU advising community, which includes faculty, staff advisors, and administrators at the university, college, and department levels. Positive, collaborative relationships must be maintained among all members of the advising community.

University resources, including both financial resources and appropriate staffing hours, that support advising goals and objectives should be appropriate to the work required.

All advisors within the SJSU advising community shall act as a source of referral to other forms of advising and support services as needed.

SJSU will create comprehensive advisor training programs and continuous professional development that focus on the quality of advising and leads to positive academic outcomes for students. Such training programs, while focusing on the responsibilities of the advisor's role, will also ensure advisors have awareness of the roles of others in the advising structure.

SJSU will develop an assessment program that evaluates the quality, effectiveness, and availability of advising services to all undergraduate student populations at various stages of their academic career.

The advising areas referenced above are defined as follows:

Major/minor Advising. Major and minor advising is defined as the utilization of program information and advising tools in partnership with student information to design a pathway to completion of their academic program.

Major and Minor advising should be faculty and department-driven.

General Education Advising. General Education advising is defined as the utilization of

General Education and SJSU Studies guidelines to assist students in identifying coursework that satisfies these requirements. Such guidance requires specialized knowledge for select programs that have General Education requirements met within the major.

General Education advising should be primarily staff advisor-driven, with appropriate consultation with departments, at the college level in the student success centers.

Career Advising. Career advising is defined as assistance for students to successfully prepare for employment through career exploration, personal skill development, and connection to employers.

Career advising should be primarily staff advisor-driven and supported at the university level. University-level career advising should also be connected to college and department-level activities, as faculty play a critical mentoring role in career choice, and student groups have formal interactions with industry members that lead to employment.

Holistic Support Services. Holistic support services provide for the student beyond their academics, including health and wellness, basic needs, financial support services, and programs that support various social and cultural identity groups. Holistic student advising requires comprehensive knowledge of the many offices and programs that provide holistic support, including, but not limited to: SJSU Cares; Student Wellness Center; Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS); Accessible Education Center (AEC); Peer Connections; Education Opportunity Program (EOP); Bursar's Office; Financial Aid Office; Cultural Centers and other Resource Centers.

Members of the SJSU advising community should be capable of providing appropriate referrals to a variety of offices based on student needs.

Approved:	May 5, 2021
Vote:	14-0-1 (via email)
Present:	Austin, Chuang, Delgadillo, Gomez Marcelino, Jackson (non-voting), Khan, Lee, Leisenring (non-voting), Rao, Rollerson, Sen, Sorkhabi, Sullivan-Green, Wilson, Wirth, Yang, Yao
Absent:	Hill, Walker, Walters, Wolcott
Financial impact:	University resources will be required to support the advising initiatives already in place and those planned.
Workload impact:	Additional advising support will be required. The university is already in the process of hiring additional advising staff.

Appendix A
Executive Summary

On April 9-12, 2019, Drs. Susan Poch, Kimberly Smith, and Vanessa Harris represented the NACADA Consultant and Speaker Services for a program review at San Jose State University (SJSU). The charge to the consulting team was to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the SJSU academic advising program and to provide recommendations to SJSU leadership. Prior to the campus visit, the consultants were provided background information regarding SJSU, college demographics, and the academic advising program that currently exists.

SJSU strengths, challenges, and recommendations identified by the consultants are highlighted below.

Strengths

- Dedicated stakeholders
- Passion for student success across campus
- Student government association has a genuine interest in enhancing advising programs and services for all students
- Established college Student Success Centers
- Faculty satisfied with advising work in college Student Success Centers
- An established, albeit not effectively functional, Advising Council
- Program directors for special population offices who are committed to student success
- SJSU is poised and ready for change in their academic advising program

Challenges

- Student dissatisfaction with advising structure and delivery
- Advising structures and processes are fragmented and confusing for students
- Lack of a standard definition of academic advising at SJSU; lack of clearly articulated definition, mission, goal statements
- Lack of a comprehensive training program
- Key administrative advising leadership position recently eliminated
- Lack of trust from the advising community toward SJSU leadership
- General lack of trust between central advising office and college success centers; role of centralized vs. departmental advising is not clear
- Lack of university-wide academics-focused communication plan
- Orientation is not academically-focused
- Inconsistent use of, and access to, technology

Recommendations

- Establish campus-wide leadership and strategic planning efforts to enhance academic advising.
- Consider an exclusively professional advisor model to more effectively meet the needs of students.
- Create SJSU advising definition, vision, mission, goals and learning outcomes that apply across the university. Clearly define roles and responsibilities of academic advisors.
- Provide a framework to evaluate and assess academic advising success.
- Create a comprehensive, ongoing, advisor training and professional development program for all faculty and professional academic advisors.
- Expand the role and responsibilities of the Academic Advising and Retention Services Office to support the leadership and campus framework of academic advising.
- Reaffirm the Advising Council to support the advancement of established university-wide strategic goals and learning outcomes related to academic advising and student success.
- Develop an advising communication plan for the institution appropriate for all constituencies.
- Revise and implement a comprehensive orientation program that gives equal prominence to students' academic journey.
- Develop and implement a technology plan for academic advising.

Conclusion

SJSU is well positioned to make innovative changes in its advising program due to recent changes in academic advising leadership and structure. Although there are some significant challenges with trust and role confusion, it is clear that students are a top focus in the academic advising program. Continued investment and attention on advising by appropriate administrators, particularly with consideration of the recommendations above, can move SJSU to a high caliber advising experience for SJSU students that can improve student satisfaction, retention, and graduation rates.

SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY
Academic Senate
Curriculum and Research Committee **AS 1810**
May 10, 2021
Final Reading

POLICY RECOMMENDATION
Amendment E to University Policy S14-5
Adopting new Program Learning Outcomes for General Education

Amends: University Policy S14-5 and 2014 GE Guidelines

Whereas: The WASC Senior College and University Commission requires that academic "programs ensure the development of core competencies including, but not limited to, written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and critical thinking" and

Whereas: General Education underwent a program review in Academic Year 2016-17 with a notable recommendation that a taskforce be created to oversee developing an "overall model for GE Assessment," and

Whereas: A task force deliberated for four months to propose new Program Learning Outcomes as a way to provide coherence to the GE program and establish a foundation for GE Assessment, and

Whereas: GE Summits were held in Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 to gather feedback for the proposed Program Learning Outcomes, and

Whereas: Curriculum and Research reviewed all feedback from the GE Summits and subsequent fora and surveys, therefore, be it

Resolved: That the attached Program Learning Outcomes and preamble be adopted for General Education to replace the existing learning outcomes.

Approved: May 3, 2021

Vote: 9-0-0

Present: Abousalem, Anagnos, d'Alarcao, Maguire, Izenstart, Kitajima, Masegian, Schult-Krohn, White(chair)

Absent: Backer

Workload impact: No impact anticipated to adopt the new learning outcomes.

Appendix

SJSU General Education Program Learning Outcomes and Goals

Preamble: SJSU's general education program establishes a strong foundation of versatile skills, fosters curiosity about the world, and prepares students to engage and contribute responsibly and cooperatively in a multicultural, information-rich society. General education classes integrate areas of study and encourage progressively more complex and creative analysis, expression, and problem solving. The program aims to equip students with the knowledge, skills, and values they need for a lifetime of intellectual and personal growth.

The program has three goals and nine program learning outcomes (PLOs):

Goal 1: To develop students' core competencies for academic, personal, creative, and professional pursuits. Goal 1 has five learning outcomes (PLOs 1-5):

PLO 1. [Oral Communication] Create and deliver logically-organized, well-supported, and compelling messages both in presentation and in conversation for specific audiences and diverse settings.

PLO 2. [Written Communication] Develop and practice a writing process that accounts for the goals, dynamics, and genres of written communication, with special attention to the conventions of writing at the university.

PLO 3. [Critical Thinking] Identify and analyze a subject/topic/issue/problem of significance by evaluating the merits of different positions or perspectives; support the analysis with relevant evidence and information while stating assumptions; and draw evidence-based conclusions.

PLO 4. [Quantitative Reasoning] Analyze, interpret, and represent quantitative information in various forms to examine a question; explain the processes behind data collection and generation; and communicate evidence in support of an argument or purpose while stating assumptions, limitations, and biases, and drawing appropriate conclusions.

PLO 5. [Information Literacy] Identify information needs, locate and access relevant and credible information while accounting for bias, and use information legally and ethically.

Goal 2: To enact the university's commitment to diversity, inclusion, and justice by ensuring that students have the knowledge and skills to serve and contribute to the well-being of local and global communities and the environment. Goal 2 has two learning outcomes (PLOs 6 and 7):

PLO 6. [Diversity, Inclusion, and Justice] Examine diverse cultures, communities, and environments; explore different perspectives; analyze connections to issues of justice/injustice; and prepare to live and work responsibly and cooperatively in multicultural societies.

PLO 7. [Civic and Global Engagement] Engage with global perspectives and knowledge; develop civic skills, interests, and values; and apply knowledge, skills and values to multicultural, community, and environmental interests.

Goal 3: To offer students integrated, multidisciplinary, and innovative study in which they pose challenging questions, address complex issues, and develop cooperative and creative responses. Goal 3 has two learning outcomes (PLOs 8 and 9):

PLO 8. [Integration and Application]: Integrate and apply knowledge and methods from more than one discipline or area of study to explore a complex question, address an issue, or produce a creative work.

PLO 9. [Reflection and Self-Assessment]: Evaluate and reflect on one's own learning while building on prior knowledge and life experiences.

SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY
Academic Senate
Organization and Government Committee **AS 1819**
May 10, 2021
Final Reading

POLICY RECOMMENDATION

Amendment D to University Policy F15-9
Budget Advisory Committee

Amends: University Policy F15-9

Effective: Immediately

Whereas: The Budget Advisory Committee is critically important in the areas of education, engagement, and transparency; and

Whereas: Effective representation of the student perspective on this committee is crucial, and is currently provided by the Associated Students (AS) President or designee; and

Whereas: Consultation with the AS leadership indicates the need for the AS Controller to represent students on budget issues; therefore be it

Resolved: That Article I.2 of F15-9 be amended as follows: Seat K be changed from "AS President or Designee" to "AS Controller or Designee."

Approved: May 6, 2021
Vote: 11-0-0
Present: Altura, Birrer, de Bourbon, Grosvenor, Higgins, Maciejewski, McClory, Millora, Okamoto, Sasikumar, Taylor, Thompson
Absent: None
Financial impact: None anticipated
Workload impact: None anticipated

SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY
Academic Senate
Curriculum and Research Committee **AS 1817**
May 10, 2021
Final Reading

POLICY RECOMMENDATION
Rescind University Policy S68-18, Special Major

Whereas: The Special Major BA/BS no longer exists because of a name change to Interdisciplinary Studies BA/BS effective fall 2021, and

Whereas: The Program and its requirements are included in the Academic Catalog (catalog.sjsu.edu), and

Whereas: Whereas other CSU campuses do not have a policy authorizing and defining procedures for their Interdisciplinary Studies (formerly Special Major) program, therefore be it

Resolved: That S68-18, Special Major be rescinded.

Approved: May 3, 2021
Vote: 9-0-0
Present: Anagnos, d'Alarcao, Maguire, Izenstark, Kaur, Kitajima, Masegian, Schultz-Krohn, White (chair)
Absent: Abousalem, Backer
Workload impact: No impact anticipated.

SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY
Academic Senate
Organization and Government Committee **AS 1820**
May 10, 2021
Final Reading

POLICY RECOMMENDATION

Amendment D to University Policy S08-4
Campus Planning Board

Amends: University Policy S08-4

Effective: Immediately

Whereas: The Campus Planning Board advises the President of the University regarding long-range physical planning for the campus and the surrounding area; and

Whereas: Effective representation of the student perspective on this committee is crucial, and is currently provided by the Associated Students (AS) Director of Business Affairs and AS Director of Sustainability; and

Whereas: Student representatives are found to experience scheduling conflicts involving their committee service and their academic activities; and

Whereas: Consultation with the AS leadership indicates a need for greater flexibility in designating students for this committee; therefore be it

Resolved: That Article 2.c of S08-4 be amended as follows: Seat 1 be changed from "AS Director of Business Affairs" to "AS Board Member," and Seat 2 be changed from "AS Director of Sustainability" to "AS Director of Sustainability or Designee."

Approved: May 6, 2021
Vote: 11-0-0
Present: Altura, Birrer, de Bourbon, Grosvenor, Higgins, Maciejewski, McClory, Millora, Okamoto, Sasikumar, Taylor, Thompson
Absent: None
Financial impact: None anticipated
Workload impact: None anticipated

SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY
Academic Senate
Organization and Government Committee **AS 1821**
May 10, 2021
Final Reading

SENATE MANAGEMENT RESOLUTION

Amends SM-S05-6
Creating a Faculty Diversity Committee

Amends: SM-S05-6

Effective: Immediately

Whereas: The Faculty Diversity Committee promotes diversity through appropriate recruitment and retention strategies, and reviews their effectiveness; and

Whereas: Effective representation of the student perspective on this committee is crucial, and is currently provided by the Associated Students (AS) Director of Academic Affairs and the Associated Students Director of Intercultural Affairs; and

Whereas: Student representatives are found to experience scheduling conflicts involving their committee service and their academic activities; and

Whereas: Consultation with the AS leadership indicates a need for greater flexibility in designating students for this committee; therefore be it

Resolved: That the membership of the Faculty Diversity Committee be amended as follows: Seat 1 be changed from “AS Director of Academic Affairs” to “AS Board Member”

Approved: May 6, 2021
Vote: 11-0-0
Present: Altura, Birrer, de Bourbon, Grosvenor, Higgins, Maciejewski, McClory, Millora, Okamoto, Sasikumar, Taylor, Thompson
Absent: None
Financial impact: None anticipated
Workload impact: None anticipated