

2024-2025 Academic Senate Minutes
September 30, 2024

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m., and 48 Senators were present.

Ex Officio: Present: Lacson, Sasikumar, Van Seist, Rodan Absent: Curry	HHS Representatives: Present: Baur, Chang Absent: Sen
Administrative Representatives: Present: Del Casino, Faas, Dukes Absent: Teniente-Matson, Fuentes-Martin	COB Representatives: Present: Chen, Vogel Absent:
Deans / AVPs: Present: d'Alarcao, Meth, Kaufman, Shillington Absent:	EDUC Representatives: Present: Mathur, Absent: Munoz-Munoz
Students: Present: Gambarin, Joshi, Khehra, Nwokolo, Plazola, Sadawarti Absent:	ENGR Representatives: Present: Elahi, Kao, Sullivan-Green, Wong Absent:
Alumni Representative: Absent: Vacant	H&A Representatives: Present: Han, Frazier, Kataoka, Lee, Riley, Shojaei Absent:
Emeritus Representative: Present: Jochim Absent:	SCI Representatives: Present: Heindl, Shaffer, Madura, Muller Absent:
Honorary Representative: Present: Peter, Absent: Buzanski, Lessow-Hurley	SOS Representatives: Present: Buyco, Raman, Pinnell, Meniketti Absent: Hart
General Unit Representatives: Present: Flandez, Masegian, Pendyala, Velarde Absent:	

II. Land Acknowledgement:

Senator Lacson read the land acknowledgment.

III. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes:

A. Senate Minutes of September 9, 2024 - approved unanimously.

IV. Communications and Questions

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Sasikumar's update featured the following:

- I would like to welcome and recognize the special guests from the university community's staff today. As a reminder, the Senate meetings are open to all, and we are very happy that you are interested in coming, but only senators may vote, and only those recognized by the chair may speak.
- Since we last met two weeks ago, I had the good fortune of attending the meeting of the Free Speech Initiative, which was convened by Georgetown University but held at SJSU. As a political scientist, I was heartened to note that our university is not only producing the workforce that will shape the future of AI and other emerging technologies but will also host those who raise critical questions about them.
- I'm happy to report that we are implementing a small technological change in our operations. In the past, when one of you wanted to suggest a change in a university policy, you went to our website and downloaded a Word document. Then, you filled it out and emailed it to the chair or senate administrator. Now, we have a new system where you can click on this link and create a referral. There is no change whatsoever to the fields that you will need to fill out. The substance remains the same. The advantage is that it creates a tracking number that you can use to follow the progress of your referral through the process. At this point, I hope you are wondering what the process is—we do have a referrals flow chart on our website; however, there are three key steps. The Senate chair assigns the referral to one or more committees, the committee chairs decide to accept or decline the referral, and in the third step, the committee brings the amendment to the Senate floor for debate, after which it is passed or not. After this, the final step is outside the Senate, where it goes to the president's desk.
- This tracking system also helps the senate chair and committee chairs to ensure that referrals are not lost in our email inboxes and to regulate the workflow among committees and across the weeks of the academic year. If you have any questions or concerns, or if you just prefer not to use the online system, feel free to email me at senate@sjsu.edu
- Our next Senate meeting is on October 14, 2024. Please note, it is for two hours only, the venue is the same. At this meeting, we will not discuss any policy amendments. The budget for the university will be presented by CFO Faas. After this, there will be presentations on the budget for the Division of Academic Affairs by Provost Del Casino and VP for Faculty Success Magdalena Barrera. Each presentation will be followed by Q and A, so

senators, please prepare questions. If you would like some help with this, please consult the webpage on the budget our Senate Administrator, Grace Barbieri, recently updated. In particular, I would draw your attention to the page on the memos exchanged between the President and the BAC, where you will see the increased role of this committee since the start of the Teniente-Matson administration.

- The Senate retreat will be held on February 7, 2025. It's a Friday, and the retreat will be in the morning on Zoom.
- I would like to appeal to you to put forward your names for the Academic Freedom Committee. The application form for this committee was sent out last week. The committee will have four faculty members, one staff member, one student, and one administrator. I am happy to answer any questions about the committee either now or later.
- Lastly, I would like to acknowledge that today is the culmination of a very long process of administrative and activist work—the final reading of the constitutional amendment and amendment to the bylaws presented by the Committee on Senate Representation. I have been told that it has been two decades since the demand to include staff on the Senate was first raised. Several senate chairs before me have worked hard to move this legislation forward. I don't take any credit for it, nor is it appropriate for me to take a position on it as the chair of this body. However, I do wish to recognize the immensity of the task that was completed today. In particular, I want to thank the members of the committee who I know have worked tirelessly—irrespective of the outcome of the vote today—many are not regular faculty members and, therefore, could have sat this out, but instead gave their time, intellect, and effort.

Questions:

Q: Does BAC have a mechanism for faculty or anyone to provide input since it is a small committee compared to the size of our university?

A: I know the committee conducted a survey for stakeholders, but I don't know if that was a one-time thing. You can email any input to them directly, I'm sure.

A: We are launching another survey soon. The last survey provided useful information that was included in some of our recommendations.

C: At the end of the town hall, there was a link for feedback. Maybe that can be sent out to the Senate.

B. From the President: Slides were circulated and presented.

V. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

Executive Committee Minutes of August 26, 2024

Executive Committee Minutes of September 16, 2024

Q: Can you explain the finances around WUE?

A: We belong to a region of 17 western states. If you join the exchange, then undergraduates in the 16 other states can apply to SJSU and receive a tuition rate of 150% of the resident tuition plus full fees. We chose which degree programs will be open to the exchange. What we have then done is looked at programs with space and put them on the exchange. We were going to put over 100 programs in the exchange. California is a net exporter in the exchange based on population, but public higher education institutions in California don't play very much in this space. The goal is to get additional enrollment. The students get that rate for four years if they are first-year students, and then two years if they are transfer students. If they do not complete it by that time, they move to the normal out-of-state rate. They can move around degree programs but only in WUE programs to keep the rate. The idea is to expand access to those 16 states and open opportunities for students to enroll and market our university out there. If done right, we backfill in programs and classes that have room. Which means there is less direct cost. Other CSUs are in WUE, like Humboldt, which has a couple hundred students. However, Northern Arizona is probably 40% out of state, so it can be popular. The WUE doesn't apply to SJSU Online, because that is at a per-tuition rate.

B. Consent Calendar: Consent Calendar for September 30, 2024

C: The title of the AS seat for FD needs to be changed.

C: Noted a typo, the faculty seat J for Faculty Diversity is Health and Human Sciences, not Science.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

Committee on Senate Representation (CSR):

The chair recognized Senator Peter

C: The committee made eight new amendments in our regular meetings on Friday 27 September, but they were not included in the Senate packet, because the deadline for the senate packet had already passed. We must incorporate them into the proposals with the body's consent, or each amendment must be raised and debated individually.

The Senate consented to adding the amendments.

Nha-Nghi Nguyen, Janet Sundred, and Senator Michael Kaufman presented AS 1876 Amendment to the Constitution of the Academic Senate of San José State University (Final Reading) and AS 1877 Amendment to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate of San José State University (Final Reading)

AS 1876

Senator Kaufman explained that we sent out a version of the proposal in the straw poll, which 34 senators opened, and more than half of all senators responded to the poll. There were three choices to incorporate staff into the Senate, and 85% agreed or strongly agreed that there should be a mechanism to add staff to the Senate, and 73% of senators agreed with scenario 3 with adding four faculty and four staff seats. The constitution says that $\frac{2}{3}$ of the senate has to be faculty, so to add staff seats, we have to add faculty seats; however, we do not have to add as many if we remove one dean seat, which changes the deans' representation on the senate from 40% to 30% and as a dean, I am supportive of this. Also, it would remove the President's voting rights on policy recommendations.

Janet Sundrud reviewed what CSR presented at the last senate meeting. The changes in today's proposal are that we changed the President to a non voting member on policy resolution, but she can still have a vote on the Sense of the Senate and Senate Management Resolutions. We felt this was a good compromise because we know the president's participation is important, and we want her to have a say in these significant statements that are issued from the Senate, but if we can remove her from the policy resolution, we can also just the $\frac{2}{3}$ rule and change it to only senators who are eligible to vote on policy resolutions. With this change in the $\frac{2}{3}$ ratio, we can also decrease the deans' seats by one instead of two. It is very important to us that the president stays engaged with the Senate, so we have added some language to the rationale about the importance of the president's continued involvement in the Senate. We also added staff eligibility criteria, which are very similar to those of the faculty.

Questions:

Q: Why are we making special considerations here for staff affairs? I hope it is not a union argument because the faculty also have a union.

A: My understanding it was to limit any conversation around staff affairs in the senate.

A: The words were carefully chosen. We wanted to make sure this remains an academic senate not a university council. We didn't want to make it seem like we could make policies that directly relate to staff that are unrelated to the academic mission of the university. Still, that staff have relevant contributions to make with regard to the other matters in the constitution.

Debate

C: It was an honor to serve on this committee. When I joined, I didn't know what would happen, but no other committee I have been on has worked harder. The central focus today and most of the process is adding staff to the senate, but there are other benefits. Our student service professionals have been eligible to serve on the Senate for decades due to an odd quirk in the constitution. We have been blessed that several have served, but for a long time, they haven't because they had to run against faculty in the General Unit to be able to be elected. By designating two seats for them, they will always be represented here. In order to expand the senate to staff and keep the $\frac{2}{3}$ rule, we have to add more faculty to the senate, which means we will see more new faces than before. This will create opportunities for newcomers who might have more diverse backgrounds, which can enrich the Senate. Finally, the GU has become different than before because we used to have a lot of librarians represented in the Senate. The general unit will shrink under this reform, but there will be more opportunities for certain faculty who have not been represented in the Senate in a long time. I encourage you all to vote for

these two amendments as well as tell your colleagues about it. It is going to take some educational campaigning to get it to pass the full faculty.

C: Senator Kataoka moved to make an amendment to strike out the number 40 and replace it with 35 on line 126. This is just a correctional amendment and is consistent with the rest of the amendment.

The Kataoka amendment was approved unanimously.

C: I am not surprised it took so long to address this matter. We have been working to be more inclusive in different policy aspects, and it only seems right to open it to staff inclusion. Passing it here may be easy, but we need to speak to our colleagues, go back to our colleges, and encourage them to pass this resolution so we can be more inclusive.

C: I think there is a sad aspect of getting this passed because former administrator Eva Joice fought for this for many years on this topic, usually against restraint. She was undying in her commitment to get staff on the Senate, and now that it is finally happening, it is very unfortunate that Eva isn't here to witness it. I think that she would be very proud, and maybe we could informally dedicate the passage of this to Eva. Additionally, in her memory, it is our duty to campaign for this for the whole university.

AS 1876 passed 41-0-0

AS 1877

Nha-Nghi Nguyen explained the changes to the bylaws that CSR has made. She then reviewed what was proposed at the September 9th meeting. The changes in today's amendment retain unit 4 SSPs ability to serve as senatorial officers and their ability to serve on the Senate committees' general unit and faculty-at-large seats.

Q: I am unaware of the current office positions unit 4 SSPs could hold. What are we retaining?

A: The retention of the officership appears in both the Constitution and the bylaws. It is discussed in section 2. Currently, we do not have any SSP officership positions, and this is based on principle.

Q: In section 1.1, all the colleges are listed except for the College of Data Information and Society, our newly formed college. What is the origin of the rule in sections 1.1.1 and 1.1.2? This seems arbitrary and not equitable.

A: The specification of the FTEs and the number of departments was done at a time when CDIS did not exist yet. I remember the rule was implemented at a time in response to the creation of a college that was deemed too small. I don't remember which one. It was one of those cases that the college had faculty members, but the feeling on the senate, and I think O&G was the creator of this bylaw, felt that the faculty should be represented not as representatives of a college but through the medium of the general unit. 50 could be an arbitrary number, and I urge you to write a referral to change that number. I think CDIS might be reaching that number soon anyway, so changing the number might not be necessary. In terms of the number of departments, if CDIS will reach that soon, then it is not necessary to change it, but I urge us to have a larger conversation about whether those numbers should be changed.

Debate

C: Senator Behin moved to amend line 168 and strike out voting members and members who have rights to vote on policy resolutions. This is consistent with the rest of the proposal.

The amendment was friendly to the body.

C: If there are problems with the bylaws, it is pretty easy for the Senate to change them through O&G or the Senate body. The bylaws do not have to go out to the faculty electorate. If the amendment passes, we have time to fix issues with the bylaws; however, we have no time on the constitutional amendment because if it is not approved by the faculty electorate this semester, it won't be in time for next year's election cycle.

Q: What happens if the constitutional amendment fails and we pass the bylaw amendments?

A: There are sections in both amendments addressing this. They both must pass to be implemented.

AS 1877 passed 42-0-0

V. Unfinished Business: None

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

A. University Library Board (ULB): No Report

B. Professional Standards Committee (PS): No Report

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

Senator Sullivan-Green presented AS 1873 Amendment A to S17-1, University Policy, Culminating Activities and Final Examinations Policy (Final Reading)

Senator Sullivan Green reminded the Senate that this amendment was introduced in the spring with the hope of being implemented in Fall 2024. However, after the Senate passed it, the president returned it to ISA with several recommendations.

First, we were asked to include additional consideration specifically for winter, summer, and special session courses. Specifically, we included those courses in lines 73-78 regarding the requirement to include a culminating activity for those courses. Then, lines 79-83 and 115-122 apply specifically to these courses. The second thing we were asked to consider was including language that addresses courses that have multiple components, like a lecture and lab. Finally, we were asked to add language regarding the oversight of culminating activities. In the process of adding these recommendations, several additional things were included. First, we added the specific language that academic scheduling and space management uses regarding terms. This is linked in a footnote on the first page of the policy. We communicated with the veteran resource center because we were given notice that there were specific issues with our veteran

students and their culminating activities. We invited Sarah Cisneros, from Academic Scheduling and Space Management to our meeting last week, and they were a great help in adding the specific language so we are consistent with what they use. If this policy passes today and the President signs it, then it could be implemented for Spring 2025. Sarah shared that they already have a webpage built that implements all of these changes. It would be ready to be published on October 22nd as soon as a Spring 2025 schedule is released. That would put them in line with the policy, and they intend to keep that pattern so they will be ahead of the deadline by a week every term.

Questions

Q: Is it the intention that a class that starts at 7:30 could ask to have the period moved earlier?

A: The request to move a class specifically because of time was not considered, and I do not believe that is something that is permitted now. There is the possibility that you could request an exception, which is written in the policy. But that would be up to your chair, director, or dean to justify that.

Q: On lines 126-127, was it the policy intent that each college would set its own deadlines, or would the Office of the Provost establish deadlines for that when implemented? I am concerned that everyone would then set their own deadlines or options.

A: The committee did not establish deadlines or structures for that, but the syllabus policy requires that the culminating activity be included in the syllabus on the first day of classes, so there is a de facto deadline. If the dean or the provost chooses to add a specific deadline, nothing in the policy requires or prevents it.

Debate

C: I have taught at 7:30 a.m., and even though that is not typical anymore, I found it always cruel on behalf of this university to force students to show up at 7:15 a.m. for a final when they have enough trouble coming to this campus at 9am. Security considerations are an issue, and the bookstore is not open, so students cannot purchase any test forms. Students often already have to drive an hour or more to reach campus. This policy is long overdue. Our commuter students shouldn't have to worry about this at the end of the semester. I think it should be even later than 8:30, but I understand we must fit several exams in one day.

Senator Del Casino proposed an amendment: An exception will normally be requested before the start of the term and approved by the Dean's Office and then included in the syllabus. In rare cases, the Dean may approve an exception by the halfway point of any given term. There was debate on the amendment.

C: If we don't set any parameters for when this will happen, people will ask later in the semester. That would then mean adjusting the syllabus, which is a contract between faculty and students. This needs to be planned out and thought through. Given what Senator Sullivan-Green said, that is normally planned in advance, and then it can be approved in the syllabus and in advance. The other option is to set hard deadlines in a semester, which I can implement as the Provost. So the real question is, do you want something here or the Provost's office to implement it this way?

C: I understand the idea of what you are saying and am not opposed to it, but there are issues

with this language. For example, try to apply it to special sessions. Also, if the request is due just before the start of the term, you are not giving the dean any time to respond. I would propose establishing an actual date. Using a term such as “the halfway point” would be very difficult to establish.

C: I understand that “the halfway point” can apply to any length of time. There could be something to add to this such as the Provost’s Office establishing a set of deadlines to coincide with this for every consideration. What I sensed was that people did not want deadlines in here.

Senator Del Casino proposed an amendment to the Del Casino amendment: “deadlines will be set for exceptions will be set by the Office of the Provost.” This amendment was friendly to the body.

C: Given the new phrase at the end, Senator Van Selst proposed an amendment to the Del Casino amendment to remove the sentence starting “with rare cases.”

The Van Selst Amendment is friendly to the body.

C: I have been a lecturer who has been asked to take on classes with very short notice, and things conflict. If we are going to mandate this, it has to happen at the start of the term. If a lecturer is given a class two days before the start, it doesn’t give them much time to have the necessary conversations.

C: That is why we added “normally.” We would create an exception to give the deans flexibility to respond to those cases. That was the point of the sentence that was cut out. We can create expectations. The syllabus update is key because it is a contract, so the students know what is coming.

Vogel amendment to change the word “exception” to “exceptions” was friendly to the body.

The Del Casino amendment passed 39-1-2

AS 1873 passed 40-0-1

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

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

Senator Wong presented AS 1878 University Policy, Adoption of Guidelines for General Education (GE), American Institutions (AI), and Writing in the Disciplines (WID) (Final Reading)

Senator Wong reminded the Senate that the GE summer group drafted this policy and guidelines this summer. Then, C&R went through the revisions, and this is the final reading. The main changes are that Area E is removed per the new CSU policy and that Areas R, S, and

V are renamed to UD area 2543, etc. Compared with the first reading, we have incorporated some questions and comments.

Q: Is AY 2034/35 correct?

A: Yes, that is correct. We have to do it again in that time frame.

AS 1878 passed 42-0-0

VII. Special Committee Reports:

Towards WSCUC Special Visit 2025: Updates and Planned Series of Actions By Senator Raman

Senator Raman explained that today's presentation is essentially focused on first-time senators, those new to the Senate, people new to the accreditation process, and people who want a little bit more context behind why we have been investing so much time and energy talking about accreditation. I am here today because of the Accreditation Review Committee, a special Academic Senate committee. WSCUC is a group of people who have signed up to perform a peer review of this institution. We love to celebrate San Jose State University's mission, vision, and values, and we are an amazing place that provides a world-class education; however, who is looking over our shoulders to ensure we do the things we say we're doing right? It sounds a bit scary, but opening up yourself to peer review and making sure all of your constituents can transparently see the workings of the university is probably the most ethical, most reasonable thing you can do to provide background and information to all the people who work around it. The body that governs us every so often comes to campus, anywhere between 6 to 10 years. We are supposed to produce an institutional report that responds to certain criteria for review. The peer review team or the special review team looks over the evidence we provide as a community and tells us how we're doing, where the gaps are, and where the success stories are. They then provided us with a report at the end of that visit, which set the tone for the remaining years. If things are not smooth enough, we may do something called a special visit, which is where I'm coming in today.

We were asked to provide an update in 2025, which is at the halfway point because we have a six-year term and are busy preparing for that. Peer review helps us make our case clearer and holds us to certain standards. Also, it benchmarks our work against external standards and determines where we need to continue to develop. Even though ARC is a special committee working out of the Senate, the role of the committee is nested in Academic Innovation and Institutional Effectiveness, headed by Vice Provost Ron Rogers. ARC is one of three groups working on the institutional effectiveness side. We're about 20 on this team. ARC's charge is to summarize the feedback received in our last visit and make it widely available. When our guests come back, we are making sure we have a communication plan and that our goals are met.

Preparing for the special visit is very important. Our last visit took place in 2022. We got an action letter with nine recommendations. We are due to submit an interim report in January. Then we have the special visit on April 9th, 10th and 11th. Campus climate has been a big

issue for a very long time, and we are very grateful Dr. Kristin Dukes, our CDO, came on board. She is working on the inclusive excellence model. We have already taken one step today by passing the amendments to include staff on the senate, but we have to get the faculty to vote for it, too.

Multiple people on this campus are working towards another pervasive problem: reducing gaps in student success. My biggest issue here is a lack of comprehension and knowledge about institutional accreditation. Getting the word out is important. Make sure that we understand what we're telling people first by bringing the process up and understanding where we are regarding our work on those recommendations.

Questions

Q: There were questions about shared governance, and as your faculty leader in the union, we have long felt that shared governance has been ignored. Are we going to be included in this? Will there be a chance to voice some changes taking place in the positive on shared governance?

A: Absolutely. We are welcome to give you feedback. The special visit is a smaller version of the regular visit, and they might want to speak with constituents. Also, we want to hear your concerns now so that our report can include the community's feedback.

Q: Shared governance was one of the key recommendations in the special visit document, and I think the Senate has made great strides today. However, I want to encourage all of the ARC members and those involved with the last special visit to think of shared governance beyond the Senate. We're working on shared governance here in the Senate, but this is not the only space on campus. Many policy decisions are not made by the Senate; the cabinet and the leadership teams on the campus make them. I hope this will be an opportunity to open up other spaces for shared governance in the accreditation team to look at. Hopefully, we can begin some preemptive discussion before the special visit occurs.

VIII. New Business: None

IX. State of the University Announcements:

A. Vice President for Administration and Finance

I was with several of you at the budget town hall earlier last week. It will be posted on the website shortly. We are also in the process of answering all the questions submitted from the town hall, which will also be posted. Coming up in two weeks, on October 14th, I'll be back here talking about the budget with you all. We are working on changing some of the slides that were already presented.

Questions

Q: I have a question regarding public safety and the increase in electric scooters on campus. At one point, I thought the university was geofenced, but students are zipping around campus and buildings. Have we considered signage or announcements because it seems especially bad this semester?

A: I agree that this is troubling. The technology has changed some years ago. Yes, we did

geofence, and the companies providing the scooters slowed to a crawl when they got there on campus. Nowadays, the price of those scooters has dropped tremendously. Our students buy them themselves, and it's not a rental; it's their device. We're working with AS. We're also working with our transportation group on how we work on our bike areas. We have cages strategically located around the campus, but they are rarely used. The only good option right now is to use their scooters outside the SRAC, so we are working to provide other options.

Q: I heard during one of my department meetings that we will encounter a 10% reduction from the state next year based on a new rule or action plan by the governor. If true, what proactive action plans or bargaining powers does the university have?

C: Firstly, a lot of this was addressed at the town hall meeting, so watch that and go through the slides. The governor has proposed an 8% budget cut across the board for our base budget next year. He also proposed that the compact not be funded next year. Those are two big funding areas that will hurt us. I discussed this at the town hall and will discuss it in a few weeks. Our enrollment is extremely positive, and so that helps offset some of the revenue problems we're having from the state. So we get to control a bit of our destiny by having that enrollment side with things we can do. In April-May, even into June, many of our union groups went up to Sacramento. They pushed the governor this past year to fund the compact; through that advocacy, we got the 5% compact this year. I highly recommend doing that advocacy again because it helps.

Q: Thank you for sending the information regarding the annual security report. Could you please discuss some of the updates and changes that will be made based on the changed numbers, such as the jump in weapons violations?

A: One crime is too many; however, our numbers are pretty good for an urban-facing campus. 99% of the time, when we have weapons, it is not our students, staff, or faculty. It is external people in the community who come onto campus or to the surrounding areas. I believe this is a safe campus, and we are doing all the right things to keep it safe.

C: Many faculty members are union members, but some people question why we do politics, and it's what Senator Faas said. For instance, We do that work to get the base budget. I keep hearing, why do we spend money on politics? Well, this is the answer. We spend money on politics to get these results. We did have a contingency on the base budget for the second part of our raise, and we got the base budget for the second part of our raise. Some people are saying the chancellor didn't fund the raises, and part of the reason is the deficit, and then the responsibility falls on the colleges and departments to fund the raises. Can you tell us if that's true or not?

A: The compact is a 5% compact that is essentially half of our budget. So you get 5% on half, and 3% of that 5% goes to salary increases. So what the Chancellor's office will do is their funding from that compact half (round numbers), and the other half has to come from each local institution. That happened last year, and it happened this year. Round numbers \$10 million last year and \$11 million this year. Each institution, in our case, is \$21 million, but if you were at Fresno or Humboldt, the numbers are slightly different. Still, it's the same type of percentage that local institutions are funding. It's not the colleges, it's not the departments it does roll down. It is the university that has to come up with that \$10 million.

Q: Is there a reason that the Chancellor's office isn't funding this more robustly on their end?

A: The 5% contract is only half of our revenues. Salaries account for 80% of our entire budget. So they are passing through to us everything that they have, but the compact only funds less than 3% raises, and we're handing out 5% raises. The difference isn't coming from the

Chancellor's Office because we don't have it. Therefore, it has to come from someone, and that someone is us or any campus locally.

Q: The Chancellor's office is now more funded than the five least funded local CSUs. Is it really the truth that they don't have the money to fund it? Also, since our enrollment is so high, why don't we get more support from the Chancellor's office?

A: I cannot answer the Chancellor's funding question. We get funding from the Chancellor's office as we get approved to have increased student FTEs. Last year, we had a total of 223 more fully funded FTEs with various reallocations from other campuses. We are planning on going over another 500 in our base budget. Then we are going to pass that by another four or five hundred. Our enrollment numbers continue to be strong, but overall, the CSU is below the target by 3% or 4%. We were one of seven who were enjoying the spoils from those other campuses that were not growing. However, overall, the CSU is having enrollment challenges.

B. Vice President for Student Affairs- Not present

C. Chief Diversity Officer

We are currently working on the Interfaith Task Force, and what I have brought today is the draft charge. The exact composition has not been determined, but this task force will report to the Campus Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (CCDEI), and I will chair it. The selection criteria will be based on the charge. The task force's composition will be faculty, staff, students, and possibly local representatives within the faith community. We're a little behind on timing, but once the selection has occurred, it should happen by the end of the semester. The hope then is to launch the task force work in January 2025. This would give a calendar year for the work to be done and a final report to CCDEI and the Office of the President.

Questions:

Q: Could you speak a little bit about the composition of the task force or how many members will be on it? Are there any concerns that some members of specific communities might feel are being excluded if they're not on the task force, and how might you address them?

A: The exact size has not been determined, but it will be a mix of students, faculty, and staff. There are a few descriptors about the type of individuals we were looking for. We're going to do our best to balance the voices while also being mindful that this is not the task force for insert faith insert this group.

Q: How are you going to make sure that this group doesn't become politically charged?

A: We will have some expectations for engagement that people will agree to when joining the task force. I hope we can think clearly about the inclusion and welcoming environment we're trying to create as a campus community. One of the things that I've heard is why touch this? This is such a polarizing topic; why touch it? My argument back is that it is a very color-blind ideology. So, at SJSU, this won't be easy, but we can lean in and be a national model for how to do this work correctly. I think this is our moment.

Q: How does the task force define faith?

A: The task force will define what faith means, but the scope of the task force is

religion, spirituality, secularism, and different world views for that reason.

D. Associated Students President

We had an activism and action field trip last Thursday, September 26th, from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., and we took some students to San Francisco's Mission District in collaboration with Centro for Hispanic Heritage Month. Legacy Month kick-off was today. Our legacy is this coming month, October, and it's meant to honor SJSU's history of student activism and student engagement on campus by commemorating our SJSU alumni, Tommie Smith and John Carlos. We invited Doctor Angela Davis. She'll be here on Thursday. We also have some appearances from Tommie Smith and John Carlos, who will visit campus later in October. Homecoming is starting soon, and we have finalized the shirt design. The theme is Spartan Glow Up.

At our last board meeting last Wednesday, we passed a resolution in support of the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe Trail of Truth mission for federal recognition. We're calling for support from our university and other surrounding colleges that reside on the tribal lands, including CSU East Bay, San Francisco State University, and other community colleges. We're also calling for support from the California State Assembly and Senate and other members of Congress. We're also encouraging students to enroll in Native American and Indigenous studies courses to join advocacy groups and get a little more educated on supporting local indigenous communities. We will also host our first monthly town hall this year on Wednesday, October 30th, from 10 a.m. to 12 p.m. I highly encourage you all to encourage your students in your classes to attend. We're hoping to get a lot of student engagement for our first town hall, and some priority topics that we'll be discussing are the time, place, and manner policy, the system-wide one and the SJSU addendum, and the total cost of attendance. We'll be having these town hall meetings monthly. We're still working on the resolution in support of the Filipino American History Mural Project. I sent an email earlier this month in case you're interested in helping donate to the cause or learning a little more about what the mural means. Also, I'm still working on filling committee positions specifically for student seats on university committees.

Questions:

Q: With the slow rollout of FAFSA, is this a problem you are seeing for our students right now?

A: Many of our students are facing this issue on this campus, and we discussed it at our last Cal State Student Association meeting. Many students are struggling with the slow rollout of FAFSA, and I know our financial aid office is trying to get it out as soon as possible. We have our student scholarships, which we're hoping to give out, but unfortunately, the slow rollout affects the financial aid office, so we had to wait.

Q: Can you speak more about AS's view on Time, Place, and Manner?

A: I think that, right now, students are still trying to gain more knowledge on it. We are trying to raise awareness and encourage our students to read it. Regarding concerns, we haven't heard any specific concerns as of now. AS published a statement in August encouraging students to be more informed and read what the TPM policy and SJSU's addendum say. I know that the Spartan Daily student newspaper has published an article about it saying that they're still waiting for more feedback from students, but on a statewide level, the other 23 campuses. There was a lot of criticism at our last plenary meeting concerning the representatives from the Chancellor's office. We collectively felt they were being performative. They talked to our Cal State Student Association president and VP of Systemwide Affairs, who is currently an SJSU

student. The representatives gave them a two-day turnaround time to meet and give feedback on the TPM policy. The students gave them nine points; out of those nine points, only three were considered and implemented. Many of the other campuses have expressed similar sentiments to ours, where they're trying to get our students more engaged and informed on what the TPM policy means, especially as we head closer to the election season.

E. CSU Statewide Representative(s):

At the General Education Advisory Committee, we discussed the Common Core numbering system, which really concerns community colleges. Still, it's going to require a lot of work to provide a single course number for any particular subject area. We also talked about GE exemptions, which were discussed last year. There was a survey to find out the current status of exemptions across the system, and the data is being collected. Senator Van Selst raised the issue of the important distinction between the guiding notes for CALGET-C and the guiding notes for GE Breadth, which essentially conflicted right now. At Academic Affairs, there was discussion around AB927 and community college four-year degrees and the current impacts that exist on several community colleges. Proposals that have been called out as duplicative by the CSU. In some cases, community colleges are still going ahead with those disputed courses. Some legislation that was supposed to have cleaned up the approval process has died in the Assembly. We discussed the policy on time, place, and manner at the plenary. The policy is designated as an interim, although nobody was particularly clear whether that means it is changeable. It is currently enforced. DVC Evans pointed out that this was essentially some framework around TMP that was required by state legislation and had to be in place at the beginning of the academic year. Also, he discussed the proposed merger between Cal Maritime and Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, which represents a template for future rationalization. He also noted that the rationalization not only refers to administration but could also include the rationalization by coursework. There's a resolution essentially conditionally supporting the integration of the two CSUs and calling for the protection of staff and faculty jobs. There's a resolution on time, place, and manner coming from the justice, equity, diversity, inclusion committee, and faculty affairs committee expressing broad opposition to both the content and the consultation process. There was a resolution to change voting eligibility in the ASCSU constitution concerning representation. The resolution says that it defines who can vote in that election. The definition is all and only faculty unit three employees. The question was raised as to what the implications of that definition are. Who had voting rights, and what about campus voting? We also had three first reading items.

Questions

Q: Was there any discussion in the ASCSU about the Chancellor's directive and the TPM policy?

A: Most of the discussion focused on the process by which the Time, Place, and Manner policy had been developed and whether it was enforced or not because it had not gone through a public consultation.

C: The Chancellor's directive apparently applies to unions, which is why the CFA filed a PERB charge against CSU, as they may have broken labor votes.

Q: What's the rationale for excluding everyone other than unit 3?

A: . I think the rationale was actually the reverse. It was extending representation because some campuses did not include lecturers, who were represented as unit 3. So, actually the intent was to expand those who were eligible to vote.

F. Provost

In August, the federal government made a series of blunders, one of which was verification. You have to verify a certain percentage. We used to be able to batch-upload them, but now we have to do it individually. In August, we had 2577 students that needed to be verified. So, we quickly met with the cabinet and decided we would not penalize any students. Also, we will hold off on charging them for school or anything else until we can complete that. We're down to 354 students now who still are in the verification process. But, no one's been removed from school as a result. We've worked with housing and other areas to ensure that if a student didn't have a full bill paid, we've managed it. A lot of work has gone into that behind the scenes.

Some good news was that our retention rate for the second year retention rate was 87.3. That is the third highest in the college state system this year. They're now analyzing this at the system level and looking at things, and we did a really good job. When you look at our total enrollment, it is definitely a combination of increasing class size at the first-year level. We're still down in transfers, but it is retention and student success that drive that. The report showed that our graduate, undergrad, and self-support mix has changed in the last 4 or 5 years. Nonetheless, our enrollment numbers are really strong, and we'll see where they go with redirection. The last thing I committed to reporting on is some of the class-size questions that came up. Last year, our Student Faculty Ratio for fall 2023 was 24.8. The preliminary analysis has come in at 25.3. When factoring in the assigned time the number will probably drop slightly. We're not back to where we were in 2017 in terms of SFR.

Questions:

Q: What were the two other schools that had better retention?

C: Officially, I don't know yet. I want us to get to 90%, which would be 100 of the 546 students we did not retain. So, we did a dive into the data, and 74 of those students had well over at 3.0 when they left. So, when we think about retention, we often use a deficit model. We think about the students who weren't doing well, but more than half of the students left in good standing. I'm looking at the grades of some of our students, like 3.9, which is four points over. We will do a clearinghouse analysis to understand where those students went and whether they're still in school. The WASC website shows that many of the students are still in college, even if not with us.

Q: How is graduate student retention?

A: Graduate student enrollment is up, but it's up in California residents more than nonresidents. I think we're up 150 year over year in graduate students and down 800 in undergrads; however, because average unit loads are up, we're ultimately up 1000 in the full-time equivalent of FTEs. I don't know the retention number, but I think they are roughly flat.

Q: How do we set the criteria or a threshold for retention each year?

A: We are involved in the Student Success Equity initiative, and one of the things we're going to build is a student equity plan for academic affairs. We need to be more precise in what we're trying to accomplish because we can talk about equity gaps, and it's important to talk about equity gaps. However, the challenge of our demographics is that closing equity gaps is not that

simple. We have to start to set more nuanced goals, and that's something we will be working on. We'll get more people involved in that conversation throughout the year.

X. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 5:01 p.m.