2021-2022 Academic Senate Minutes  
December 6, 2021

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex Officio:</th>
<th>CHHS Representatives:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present: Van Selst, Curry, Rodan, McKee, Kaur</td>
<td>Present: Sen, Smith, Schultz-Krohn, Baur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent: None</td>
<td>Absent: None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Representatives:</th>
<th>COB Representatives:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present: Day, Del Casino, Faas, Papazian</td>
<td>Present: Rao, Tian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent: Wong(Lau)</td>
<td>Absent: None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deans / AVPs:</th>
<th>COED Representatives:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present: Lattimer, Ehrman, d’Alarcao, Shillington</td>
<td>Present: Mathur, Muñoz-Muñoz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent: None</td>
<td>Absent: None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students:</th>
<th>ENGR Representatives:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present: Chuang, Cramer, Walker</td>
<td>Present: Sullivan-Green, Saldamli, Kao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandoval-Rios, Allen, Kumar</td>
<td>Absent: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent: None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alumni Representative:</th>
<th>H&amp;A Representatives:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absent: Walters</td>
<td>Present: Khan, Frazier, Han, Massey, Kataoka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absent: Hsu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emeritus Representative:</th>
<th>COS Representatives:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present: Jochim</td>
<td>Present: French, White, Switz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absent: None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honorary Representative:</th>
<th>COSS Representatives:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present: Peter, Lessow-Hurley</td>
<td>Present: Hart, Sasikumar, Wilson, Raman, Haverfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent: None</td>
<td>Absent: None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Unit Representatives:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present: Higgins, Masegian, Yang, Lee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent: Monday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Frazier read the Land Acknowledgement.

III. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes**—
The Senate approved the Senate Minutes of November 8, 2021 (36-0-4).
IV. Communications and Questions –
A. From the Chair of the Senate:
Chair McKee 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 AVC Massey. Remember that the chat is visible to all and even the direct chat is visible to the Chair and Senate Administrator in the saved version of the meeting, so be cautious.

Chair McKee announced that Senator Sullivan-Green would be on sabbatical for Spring 2022 and that the Senate needs to elect a new Chair of the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee. Please contact Chair McKee if you are interested.

President Papazian will host her annual holiday celebration for the Senate on Thursday, December 9, 2021 from 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m. in the Student Union, Room 1.

Spring 2022 Senate meetings will continue to be via zoom.

A Save-the-Date notice will be coming out shortly for the Annual Senate Retreat on Friday, February 18, 2022. This is under the purview of Senate Vice Chair Karthika Sasikumar and will be a virtual event.

A goal of the Academic Senate is to be a safe place for shared governance among many diverse voices, not just those voices that are frequently heard. Please keep this in mind and adhere to the speaker’s list and keep comments as short as possible.

Please minimize any unnecessary wordsmithing on the floor of the Senate. Most amendments should be brought to the attention of the policy committee chair prior to the meeting.

Chair McKee announced this will be President and Senator Papazian’s last meeting with the Senate. The Academic Senate thanked the President for her service and wished her well.

B. From the President:
The president announced that she was very pleased the holiday celebration with the Senate would be in person this year and was really looking forward to it.
The president acknowledged the commitment to shared governance at SJSU and stated that it was critical to the university’s operations. She has enjoyed working with the Senate and each and every Senator.

The Community, Safety and Policing Report is being wrapped up. This is a complicated issue particularly for an urban campus. The president commended the taskforce on their work. The report will be released tomorrow. There are many recommendations. Much of this is about systemic change and ensuring we have an environment where everyone here feels valued and safe.

The president has sent a message to the campus that we are really paying attention to COVID variants and right now that’s Omicron. The president encouraged everyone to get the booster shot, continue to wear their masks, and to continue to implement safety measures.

We have extended the application deadline to December 15, 2021. Enrollment is robust and applications are up for Spring. We are the only campus in the North with this positive of enrollment numbers for Spring 2021. We will compare numbers against the Enrollment Management Plan and that will guide the decisions going forward. Kudos to the faculty and staff for creating the kinds of academic programs that draw students and the kind of environment that has made us a highly desired university.

The Asian Pacific Islander Desi American (APIDA) Center has put an offer out for a director. We have announced that we will be launching the Native and Indigenous Student Success Center as well.

Just to reiterate, the Senate Holiday Party is December 9, 2022. This will be followed by 13 commencement ceremonies. Thank you to everyone that will be volunteering. This year we will honor the 2020-2021 graduates as well.

The transition over to Interim President Perez is going well. We are all working together as a team to ensure a smooth transition.

Questions:

Q: There were some particular deadlines in October and November from the Department of Justice for certain things to be aligned at SJSU as part of the settlement. Can we make that a part of the regular presidential update to the Senate each month?

A: [President Papazian] It is a robust set of expectations and there are numerous deadlines. The project manager for all of it is Lisa Millora. Of course, much of the work is done by the Title IX Office. Lisa is the point person and will always have the most up-to-date status of any of those expectations. Much of the conversation we have with the Department of Justice is managed by the Office of General Counsel in the Chancellor’s Office. It is all going very smoothly. There will be updates on the website.
C: [Chair McKee] Lisa Millora is not a member of the Senate, so Chair McKee will work with her on a process for updating the Senate.

Q: There is a concern that with the recent student’s account being hacked and the threat the campus received of a mass shooting that faculty were not given enough information as to whether they should cancel class, or go on with it. Can you comment on that?
A: [President Papazian] Sure, and then I’ll turn it over to VP Faas who oversees that. It was deemed by the University Police Department (UPD) not to be credible threat very early. There is a pretty detailed and robust process that they use and it involves other agencies as well. [VP Faas] During the Thanksgiving holiday, a hacker that was physically located in Illinois and had done this same thing a number of times to other institutions, hacked an SJSU’s student’s account and made a threat to the university. We sent out a message early on that we were aware of the threat, but that we did not believe it was credible. Honestly, from that point on it was deemed not credible and we announced that business as usual should continue. We did increase the number of police on the campus that day. There was nothing unusual that day. A few people reported miscellaneous packages being left out that we responded to and were able to determine they weren’t a threat, although one led to an unrelated arrest. People got it that if you see something, then report it to the police. I’m not sure what else we can say or do. It was not a credible threat. In case there is a credible threat, we will be ready. People don’t usually announce it when they plan on hurting a lot of people. They want to see as many casualties as they can and they want to see the element of surprise. The FBI, several Sheriff’s departments, and the San José Police Department are all involved in making sure our community stays safe.

[VP Faas] Yesterday, the San José Police Department heard a shot down in the South Campus area. They deployed and we also deployed down to the parking garage on South campus. We secured and searched the building. We found empty shell casings in the garage. There were no witnesses, no suspects, and no victims. As soon as we heard about the shot, we alerted our neighbors, as well as the Giants and the Sharks to make sure everyone was safe. As soon as we got the all clear, we got the message out to the campus.

C: I just wanted to thank President Papazian, in particular, for remembering us and for her work on getting the APIDA and Native American Student Success Centers up and running. I think we have taken extraordinary steps towards being a more inclusive campus.

V. Executive Committee Report:
A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:
   EC Minutes of October 4, 2021 – No questions.
   EC Minutes of October 18, 2021 –
   Questions:
Q: What does “approachable policing” mean on page 8? Does it mean they will be walking around or visible in their cars? Will they be carrying guns?
A: Our officers are sworn police officers and they must carry their weapons on them at all times. If they did not that would be putting them at risk. What we are looking for in approachable policing is security policing. It is finding the opportunity for our police officers to meet with faculty, staff, and students in a non-confrontational setting. This is something like a coffee with a cop, or a donut with a cop, or just meeting on the corner to discuss something. We want our officers to walk or bike around the campus, but to also stop and interact with the campus community. Too often, the only time people interact with police is when there is an incident. We want there to be times when all of us interact with our officers.

B. Consent Calendar:
There was no dissent to the Consent Calendar of December 6, 2021.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

VI. Unfinished Business: None

VII. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation)
A. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
   Senator White presented AS 1807, Adoption of Guidelines for General Education (GE), American Institutions (AI), and the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) (First Reading) (Attachment – GE Guidelines).

Questions:
Q: Thank you and C&R for all the work put into this policy for two years. I have two questions. On the fourth Resolved clause it says, “the GE, AI, and GWAR Guidelines shall undergo a full university review.” Do you mean the program itself will also undergo a full university review? Is that something that C&R considered? Then in general with the guidelines, C&R is the ultimate responsible party for the guidelines and yet there is nothing in here that says that. Was this overlooked?
A: You are correct. GE as we are now considering it is that we are going to treat it as a program and all programs on the campus undergo program planning and review. I will definitely take this back to the committee and we can clean this up, but in essence when a program undergoes review, it would be initiated by the GE adviser and then they would come up with a program plan, and that program plan would then undergo external evaluation and review, with recommendations coming from the Program Planning Committee. You are correct, the GE Guidelines are under the purview of C&R, but C&R does not make major changes to the GE Guidelines without undergoing more review. This is why we do have the resolved clause about minor changes. We will bring this back with
recognition that the GE Guidelines are under the purview of C&R with full Senate review.

Q: Would C&R consider reviewing page 18, I found that page a little difficult to understand? It appears as if the departments no longer have to have do Assessment Learning Outcomes (ALO) annual assessments, but we would still have to do annual program assessments based on what I read on page 8. I fear we are adding a lot more to assessment without taking significant loads away.
A: C&R is still working on the assessment part of it, but you are correct the ultimate goal is that the GE area learning outcomes will proceed to the program planning process and will no longer be in the yearly review submitted for these things. I will reach out to you to get more details. This is one of the main things we will be working on next semester. This is a work in progress right now.

Q: I would like to commend your process in developing these guidelines. Under recent legislation, GE will change in some form. What impact does that have on this process today?
A: I don’t have a crystal ball of that. What Senator Van Selst is referring to is the new recently passed legislation asking the CCCs, UCs, and CSUs to get together and come up with a universal GE package. We don’t have an answer for this yet. Part of that legislation is the establishment of a committee with representatives from all three groups and then that committee would make its recommendation. One plan that has been discussed extensively is that there is a five-unit difference between the CSU and UC GE packages. When you dive into the details of those five units, you see that the UC does not have a Communications GE, nor do they have a Human Understanding, Area E. This is probably one of the biggest points of contention between the CSU and UC as to how this will be resolved. There is no answer right now. How it should work is the committee would make its recommendations, then the systems would provide feedback, and then this would probably result in a change to the GE program from the Board of Trustees. After that we would work on our GE. Right now, it would have no impact on the guidelines. I think the legislation says that a plan must be in place by 2023.

Q: On pages 3 and 4, under approved modifications, there are clearly outlined steps that an approval has to go through. Category A says simply that it must be approved by the General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC). I know that is consistent with the current guidelines, but what I’ve noted here is that even though this says it must be approved by GEAC, there are many more layers of approval that are being enforced right now. Has the committee thought about that and does the committee feel that all that is needed is GEAC approval and are the other processes just steps to get it into the catalog, or what process would that be?
A: I was not aware that for Category A there were other steps involved, so C&R will have to investigate this. My understanding was that all Category A required was approval by GEAC. I will have to reach out and find out exactly what those steps are. I would agree with you that according to the current guidelines, only GEAC approval is needed.

C: It could be that the other steps are just to get it into the catalog, but C&R should investigate to be sure.

Q: Can only areas C and D overlay with American Institutions (AI)?
A: Yes, you are correct that only areas C and D can overlay with AI.

Q: On the bottom of page 7, do the minimal qualifications for an instructor and excellence in teaching only apply to those with a Master's degree?
A: Are you asking if the minimal qualifications in teaching applies only to those with Master’s degrees? I’d have to go back and ask the committee, but from what I understand the excellence in teaching applies to both those with a Master’s or Ph.D.

Q: Would C&R reconsider the language there, because it reads as if it only applies to those with Master’s degrees. My next question is about assessment. I also agree there is a lot of confusion about the assessment process. Specifically, current GE guidelines cover three program goals, but each program goal has a different program learning outcome (PLO). Even the assessment guidelines state that not all GE areas cover all PLOs. GE ALO is typically three or four items, but these three or four items don’t cover all PLOs. A common number of PLOs is eight or nine. It would be very helpful if the assessment part is redone to make it clear whether the assessment has to address GE ALOs or GE PLOs.
A: This is something we are still working on. ALOs will not be used for assessment other than for recertification of the course. From an assessment point of view, especially from a Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) point of view, it has got to be the PLOs. Just to reiterate, the PLO will not map to the GE ALOs. The PLO will only map to the GE area.

Q: I’d like to commend the committee on the inclusive way this was handled. On page 10, the 2nd line, it talks about a guide for multilingual speakers or something of that nature. I developed one of those guides looking at Indian English. Page 10 talks about the 10 most common errors made by multilingual writers. I hope the committee will consider putting a slash after errors and variations because many of these differences are not considered errors, but are considered variations. Also, in several places you refer to English language learners and multilingual speakers. I’d like to know what the difference is, because English language learners are multilingual speakers?
A: That language came from the University Writing Committee. I can certainly ask them those questions and get clarification.
Q: This is about AI overlay, I would like to encourage the committee to remove the restriction to C and D only, both to allow a previously unknown oral communication and to think about how area F might interact with unit limits and degree programs.
A: I will definitely bring that back to C&R as well.

C: Please send Senator White any comments and suggestions.

Senator White presented **AS 1825, Policy Recommendation: Establishment, Reporting, Continuation and Termination of Campus Centers and Institutes (CCI), Formerly known as Organized Research and Training Units (ORTU) (First Reading).** This policy is coming forward as a replacement for University Policy S05-13 due to the significant changes being made.

**Questions:**

Q: One typical problem is that when one of these programs folds up and goes away, it tends to be a ghost for a number of years. Is that what this policy is addressing, or what is this policy going to address?
A: The reason this got brought to our attention is the new Vice President of Research and Innovation (VPRI). We are also out of compliance with the Chancellor’s Office. We also needed to be explicit about who would fall under the policy.

Q: Over time some of these ORTUs fade but they still remain visible on the San José State University website as a training unit, so there is confusion as to which units are active and which are not. You seem to have laid out a very clear process here in terms of the 7-year report. Is there a process for actually closing out an ORTU or terminating an ORTU?
A: To my knowledge there is no process. It is just recommended to be closed. I can certainly ask C&R to come up with a process.
C: I would highly recommend adding a process. It doesn't have to be complicated.

Q: Can you clarify if centers can develop curriculum or just enhance curriculum as they always have in the past?
A: We can definitely take this up, but in our discussions it was enhancement.

Senator White presented **AS 1791, Policy Recommendation, Accessibility in Curricular Materials (First Reading).**

This is coming back as a second first reading. Lots of the feedback we got from the Senate boiled down to how do we, as faculty, figure out where that help is on campus. Things are not centralized on campus. We
really wrestled with that aspect of it. The other aspect we were asked about is if there is a budget line for that type of material. I spoke to the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) about this and unfortunately we do not have a budget line for this and the reason is because this branches across many, many areas. It is part of a bigger initiative across the campus. There are lots of moving parts in here. This is really about making our materials accessible. The Provost agreed to be the central place for this.

Questions:
Q: This question relates to the 2nd resolved clause which says our faculty must select all accessible materials. Do our faculty have to select only reading materials that are in an accessible format?
A: It does stipulate that it must be in an accessible format, but materials could be converted to an accessible format. You would have to work with either the Center for Faculty Development (CFD) or e-campus to make sure the materials were accessible.

Q: My concern is about the phrase in the 4th resolved clause that says, “faculty will ensure.” Would the committee consider saying, “the university will ensure”?
A: We did discuss this and the committee decided not to change that phrase, but we did add into the resolved clauses “with help from the Accessible Education Center (AEC), Affordable Learning Solutions, and e-Campus”. C&R feels this is everyone’s responsibility. The only reason an item should not be made accessible is if there isn’t a technology that can make it accessible. The university would be responsible for purchasing whatever technology is required to make the materials accessible. The faculty member is responsible for getting the materials turned in by the deadline so they can be made accessible. I would be happy to take language back to the committee that you have crafted for that resolved clause for discussion.

Q: Regarding the last resolved and with regard specifically to program planning. One of the things we tried to do when we revised the program planning policy was eliminate a lot of the “checkboxing” and unnecessary reports that were happening to make program planning a forward-thinking process. It seems like this is just another element that says “you do this,” as opposed to making it a meaningful process of review. To me, what this policy says is that every seven years the department should check on accessibility, but in-between there really doesn’t need to be any checks on accessibility. When you are preparing for your program planning report maybe you should do a little bit of quick assessment to be sure at least the syllabi are accessible, but really there is no depth here in terms of what is the process the department would have to go through to check through all the curricular materials across the department. It would really have to happen in that sixth year right before the seventh year but the rest of
those years there is no accountability, except the Provost is accountable. In terms of the department, there is no depth here. Did C&R consider that? What is the process? How can we make that process more meaningful in terms of change as opposed to just having a checkbox that this is done?

A: That’s a great question that we have not been able to resolve. Even if we don’t have a policy on campus, federal law stipulates that our materials must be made accessible. It is very hard when you are trying to strike that balance and put something into policy. I agree with you that essentially this is a checkbox, but at the same time we are sending emails every semester and every year to faculty alerting them that they need to have accessible materials. By putting it into program planning, we at least ensure the department undergoes its own self-study and checks these things. Presumably, if you are a faculty member and already have your materials in an accessible format, it shouldn’t be that hard. The only time you would have to do this again is when you are developing something new for your class. The question we can never seem to answer is what percentage of our curriculum is 100% accessible. I don’t have an answer for that.

C: The software tools are far from perfect and it’s my understanding that the software tools currently available only identify about 25% of the cases. Secondly, much of this material is widely dispersed making it extremely difficult for any kind of a centralized review of accessibility. Therefore, I think to place the burden on the university creates an enormous burden on workload for people in Information Technology (IT) for example, which I think is unreasonable. I think it is not unreasonable to ask the faculty to take responsibility for ensuring the material they post is accessible. That doesn’t mean they need to do the work, but ultimately it means that the responsibility comes down to the faculty. Rather than saying that faculty “ensure accessibility” it might say something like faculty “are ultimately responsible for ensuring the materials associated with their course are accessible”.

A: I will definitely bring that language back.

Q: [Provost Del Casino] We have reinvigorated our Accessible Technology Initiative with the system and are doing a lot more there now and should have centralization and a better understanding of where those services are going to come from. I will say to Senators Peter and Rodan, there are some things that we might not be able to afford to convert, because people are using antiquated 3rd party platforms for textbooks and things like that would be too expensive to convert. It can’t be that every single thing that everyone wants in their class can be made accessible. It might not be fiscally responsible to do so. As we look at this there is a question of cost that we are going to have to look at. It gets even messier with the way people connect through API and 3rd party technology. The
more we send people out of the institution, the less we have control over
the accessible content. There are many pieces here. There may be some
cases we don’t say yes to certain content or links, because they won’t
meet the accessibility requirements of the institution. A faculty member
may have to pivot as a result. It is very complicated and will take a lot of
work, diligence, and review.

Q: I would be more in support of a resolution that does not put more
responsibility on the backs of the faculty and the departments where we
don’t have the time or the resources. There is no way we could pull this
off. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to make sure their
materials are accessible. On the other hand, just like the policy says this
is going to be expensive and time consuming and unless the university is
prepared to provide us the resources to do this, it cannot be done.
A: [Provost Del Casino] It is not true that all of this is expensive. Some of
it is actually quite simple and there are a lot of technologies that allow one
to make a lot of material accessible already. The places we run into
issues some time is in captioning and transcription. You’re going to need
an office to support this. Although, there is more and more technology
every day that is doing so much with simultaneous transcription, including
this software that is making this meeting accessible as we speak. I’m not
100% sure we are going to have to spend millions of dollars and take
thousands of hours. There are lots of ways to simply how we do certain
things that will allow for accessibility. I agree we don’t want to create a
separate job for everyone, but I’m not sure that everything is that
demonstrably difficult to pull off. A lot of courses aren’t that complex in
terms of the materials they have.

C: I would like to ask the committee to think of two things separately.
One would be the syllabi and the other would be all the ancillary materials.
Right now I don’t know if it is by policy or just practice but syllabi are
attached when a course is updated or submitted. I’m just amazed at how
frequently accessibility issues arrived there that were not seen before. It
could be worth thinking about that. It is, in fact, part of the Retention-
Tenure-Promotion (RTP) process.

Q: When I was Senate Chair in 2006, the Chancellor’s Office decided
everything had to be accessible and we had many of these conversations.
I would hope and believe there should be a great deal more technology
available to do this now then there was 16 years ago. I do have a concern
about making it the responsibility of the faculty member. At the time we
discussed this years ago, we were talking about having some kind of
central service. De Anza had a service even for copies where you could
drop something off and have it land in your mail box. At the time, the CFD
was going to be the agency that handled this. I share everyone’s concern
about the language that faculty will ensure this happens. I also have
concern about the following resolved that talks about, “if materials can’t be made accessible.” There is no agency in that resolved. Speaking as a former Senate Chair, I can tell you this is where things can get sticky if no agency is identified as having responsibility for finding an equally effective alternative to be created and provided. I think this resolved needs to be more specific.

A: I will definitely bring this back to C&R as well.

C: A lot of what was said today is focused on the idea of making hard copies accessible to our students. Increasingly, this is a smaller and smaller part of what is being done in the classroom. It is really important to me that we don’t have a chilling effect on innovation and thinking out of the box for new faculty members. As a new faculty member, I would be extremely scared of being accused of violating these norms around accessibility. I think we need to be aware of this, especially in those disciplines that have historically not been that dependent on texts.

B. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
Senator Hart presented AS 1821, Senate Management Resolution, Amends SM-S05-6, Creating a Faculty Diversity Committee (Final Reading).
Senator Kaur presented an amendment to the last line of the Resolved clause to change, “AS Board Member” to “AS Board Member or graduate student.” The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Kaur amendment passed (37-2-4). The Senate voted and AS 1821 passed as amended (39-0-2).

Senator Hart presented AS 1819, Amendment D to University Policy F15-9, Budget Advisory Committee (Final Reading). The Senate voted and AS 1819 passed as written (41-0-0).

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

D. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA): No report.

E. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
Senator Schultz-Krohn presented AS 1824, Amendment F to University Policy S15-8, Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and Standards: To include within the category of Service, activities that specifically enhance inclusion, educational equity and engaged service with students and in the surrounding and broader communities (First Reading).

Questions:
None
VIII. Special Committee Reports: None

IX. New Business: None

X. State of the University Announcements:

A. CSU Faculty Trustee:

The Board of Trustees (BOT) held their first in person meeting since January of last year in November.

Chancellor Castro announced that 95% of CSU students and 96% of our employees have been fully vaccinated. Our campuses are some of the safest places to be.

The BOT approved the transition to a Cal Poly for Humboldt. This will make it the 3rd Cal Poly.

I’m happy to report that this year the budget request from the BOT is robust. We have a new attitude and are being more assertive in our budget requests. The request would amount to about a 17% increase in our ongoing augmentation from the state. In addition, we asked for $1 billion in one-time funds. These are staggering numbers, yet the state budget this year is very, very good. It is reported that the state will have a surplus of $31 billion. It is the BOT responsibility to clearly articulate our financial needs to the legislature. I did try to convince the BOT to double the $223 million they requested for the budget to include employee salary increases. Regrettably, my motion failed by one vote. Subsequently, on the second day of the meeting several members were sympathetic to my request, but the BOT wanted us to be able to present greater evidence for such a high amount. In the end, the Chancellor’s Office agreed to conduct a study on faculty salaries to go along with the staff study that was already commissioned to us. The study results should be available in April and it is my hope that the stakeholders (faculty, staff, administrator, students, etc.) will join us in lobbying our legislators in Sacramento.

Questions:

Q: Thank you for the fine work you have been doing. In regard to the studies, we have had numerous faculty salary studies over the years, so good luck with that. How are negotiations going between the CSU and UC over GE and who is involved in this process?

A: To reiterate, when the legislation passes, the CSU must comply. The UC is willing to accept our Ethnic Studies requirement. However, in the end I think the CSU will not be able to maintain its GE size. We will most likely have to cut our GE to be in line with what the UC requires.

Q: Did the presidential and faculty salary comparisons include the full value of the retirement packages and things like the housing allowance, etc.?
A: When the study of presidential salaries was done and a significant lag in CSU presidential salaries was discovered, myself and several other BOT members brought up that the CSU offers a very generous benefits package to presidents. Consequently, the study was done again and included these benefits, but it turned out the gap had widened and made the argument for an increase in the president's salary even stronger. There was a lot of debate that we should have done a faculty salary survey at that time as well. This year the legislature allocated a relatively high dollar amount for the CSU to conduct a study of staff salaries which is currently underway. The Chancellor’s Office will pay for the faculty salary survey.

B. Statewide Academic Senators:
Senator Curry provided the CSU Statewide Senate report. The ASCSU will have a plenary meeting January 19-21, 2022. This could possibly be face-to-face. I sent you the ASCSU resolutions that will be discussed Friday. If you would like the full text of the resolutions, please let me know. We are working on a way to make the resolutions available to you as soon as we get them. To improve our reporting in the future, we will continue to send out our written report.

Questions:
Q: From the previous ASCSU meeting, did the Chancellor respond to the presidential resolution that passed on November 4, 2021?
A: We do regularly get responses. I will have to check the webpage to see if it was responded to yet. I don’t think so. I did send all of you a link to the ASCSU webpage where the resolutions are listed and there is a column where the Chancellor’s responses are attached and you can read them. I will look for this and get back to you.

C. Provost:
We are in the process of evaluating Graduation Initiative (GI) 2025 goals. We received some one time dollars for that.

We are also working on some things relative to the presidential transition in January. We are also dealing with some personnel issues like sabbatical committees, and we will start to see some retention evaluations soon that we will be working on. We’ve had some changes in faculty positions. We have authorized one or two additional hires in line with our goals of tenure density and things like that.

We are also working on compliance with AB 275, which includes amendments to the California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (CalNAGPRA) (AB 978) to cover non-federally recognized tribes. We are working on compliance with that law and also filing a final report on our consultations with the Native American and Indigenous Communities that is due on January 1, 2022. We also have to present to the
Native American Heritage Commission sometime in January on what we’ve been doing. We’ve authorized the collections to be overseen at the university level, and I’ll be appointing the NAGPRA Coordinator and Tribal Liaison into the Provost Office. Our goal is over the next two to three years to repatriate the materials appropriately to the various tribes. The law is very specific on consultation with the tribes and adhering to those consultations that come from the tribes. We’ve been working on this since last fall. We knew AB 275 was going to be passed and we’ve been preparing for this. We are well ahead of other campuses in the CSU as far as complying with the law and making sure things are handled appropriately. There are a lot of people that have been working very hard on this.

Questions:
Q: Many departments are voting now, so would your office ensure that all the information is presented about the online initiative so that people can make an informed decision and secondly, if a department votes it down will the university take it over and implement it? What are the consequences?
A: [Provost] No. If the department doesn’t want to offer a degree in CSU Online, then they don’t want to offer a degree.
Q: What about making sure they get all the information?
A: [Provost] I’m going to completely disagree with that one. Ron Rogers has been going from department-to-department going through in great detail every single bit and piece and the ways we can bring lecturer faculty into stateside pay, and the ways we can adjust self-support dollars. All of these questions have been answered over-and-over again with the faculty. Frankly, some faculty have just decided to say no, so okay we will move forward with departments that want to move forward. However, I have to disagree with the notion that the information is not out there. There have even been written responses from the Vice Provost to a number of departments on the issues raised over-and-over again.
Q: With all due respect Provost Del Casino, we have asked this question of University Personnel (UP) and they have not given us an answer. We have asked this question of Faculty Services and they don’t know. So for you to say departments have all the information, I have to disagree. People have been coming to us and saying we have to vote, but we don’t know what we are voting on.
A: [Provost] Is that a Senate question, or a union question?
Q: It is a Senate question, and has been asked on the Senate floor.
A: [Provost] Frankly, I’m not sure where the disconnect is in terms of what you are trying to say. The truth is UP and Faculty Services don’t make the decisions on whether we use a different salary schedule in order to compensate people for teaching in self-support programs. We are already the largest self-support program in the CSU at roughly $50 million. Hundreds of faculty teach in that program and have for years. There is nothing new there. The only thing we have suggested is that we might actually compensate people more if we feel it is appropriate. The only other option we
have, that I’ve mentioned over-and-over again, is that we can buy lecturers out. The reason there isn’t one answer is that departments are run differently in the ways they hire faculty. We are trying not to impose that this is the only way to do x and y in terms of how departments run themselves. I’m not trying to divert the question at all. I think in many ways we have provided multiple models on how we can address those issues that have been raised. I think we’ve been really clear. I’m happy to come back and discuss these issues with the Senate when we meet again in February.

Q: Provost Del Casino, you’ve only spoken about lecturers that are 1.0 and not part time faculty.
A: Part time faculty have, typically when teaching in self-support programs, been paid on self-support rates as are faculty that teach in the summer. That is one option, but it could be that people move to full time rates or are bought out as a result. There is nothing that stops us from doing that. I’ve encouraged departments to look at that. I’m a fan of increasing people’s full time job opportunities and increasing the number of full time positions we have. This is one way we can do this. This is an opportunity to possibly extend part time employees full time employment. I appreciate the questions.

Q: Many students are still struggling getting the coursework done with the changes in modality, and also sickness. Many faculty feel that things are changing in their classrooms every day. Departments are now having to evaluate faculty. Would you consider some ways of giving accommodations in SOTES for faculty?
A: We issued a memo that goes into the every faculty file that goes through the review process. That memo is standing for at least the next six or seven years that says please recognize that faculty must be supported in recognizing how the pandemic has affected their teaching and learning. That memo is still there and can be used for this year. I’ve encouraged departments to read and take into consideration the memo, and when I review files I will absolutely be taking into consideration the memo I wrote.

Q: There are often requirements and then how that is implemented through policy, so should we have a broader conversation about collecting artifacts and what our process should be?
A: At the moment there is NAGPRA and CalNAGPRA and then AB 275 which is an amendment to CalNAGPRA. Each of these has specific laws with rules attached to it. The larger question is how do we look at those sorts of remains. It is a very complicated thing that gets into the space of academic disciplines, the practices of faculty, what are the ethical standards for these things. It might be a Senate conversation if the campus is interested in a larger discussion of this matter. It goes to museum collections and all kinds of stuff. It is a complicated process. What we are dealing with in NAGPRA, CalNAGPRA and AB 275 is very specific and it is prescribed in law how we are supposed to implement.
Q: I’m from Communications Studies and we have had many very informative meetings with Ron Rogers on SJSU Online. However, I concur with Senator Khan that lecturers still have questions. What I propose to do is to post their questions in the chat. Then could you respond over time. Would that be okay?
A: Chair McKee responded that that would fine.

D. Associated Students President (AS):
AS President Kaur announced that their marketing department received three awards in the ACUI regional graphic design competition. Big applause for them.

We are low in student applications for jobs. If you know students that are interested in a job, please send them our way.

We are currently celebrating our graduating students this week. I will be attending 13 ceremonies.

Holiday cards and videos will be out soon.

Good Luck on finals and grading and Happy Holidays!

E. Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF):

F. Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA):
Our numbers are flat for spring right now. Our fall applications are up significantly in Frosh and Transfer applications. We are up over 11,000 in our Frosh applications and 2,700 in our transfer applications.

We have finished our Strategic Enrollment Plan. This is about guiding enrollment for the future. We are also looking at our financial aid allocation and what our strategy is.

We will be having a deadline of January 10, 2022 for COVID vaccine compliance by our students. We will be dropping students early. We will not be carrying them through the semester.

I serve on the California Student Aid Commission. I will say that the California Equity Framework, AB 1456 that was vetoed by the governor will be coming back around. There is still a commitment to thinking about the future of Cal Grants. We provided existing Cal Grants to community colleges this year.

We have had a decline in Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) applications. This is deeply concerning. Across the state of California we are down about 200,000 FAFSA Applications. FAFSA is the entry point into all
forms of financial aid. We are down with Frosh, but up with our transfer students at SJSU in particular.

Questions:
Q: I’m astonished about the FAFSA news. What can we do about it?
A: There is a hearts and minds element and I think we need to help students figure out what is best for their family.
C: I am also very concerned about this. We have so many students that are eligible and they just need help applying, so I’m glad you are looking for strategies VP Day.

Q: Are we prepared to accept all those students if they decide to come to SJSU for fall 2022? You talked about trying to work on expanding the areas we can recruit from where students could get a bump in their Grade Point Average (GPA) up the peninsula. Have you made any progress on this?
A: First, everyone was shocked about the 200,000 applications. We need to think about what can and should we be doing in that area. The Strategic Enrollment Management Plan calls for us to think about the number of students we will accepting and what our classes begin to look like. Let me be clear. This doesn’t mean SJSU will look different, but it does give us the opportunity to look at the number of students we are going to accept as far as graduate and undergraduate and how we begin to shape our enrollment. We aren’t making admissions decisions yet for fall 2022. As for your second question, we have been focusing on how we can expand this year and not so much recruiting. However, it is still something we will be working on as far as recruiting up the peninsula.

G. Chief Diversity Officer: Not present.

XI. Adjournment: The Senate adjourned at 5:00 p.m.