

2023-2024 Academic Senate Minutes
May 6, 2024

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m., and 47 Senators were present.

Ex Officio: Present: Curry, Multani, Sasikumar, Van Selst, Rodan Absent: McKee	HHS Representatives: Present: Baur, Chang Absent: Sen
Administrative Representatives: Present: Del Casino, Faas, Teniente-Matson, Fuentes-Martin, Dukes Absent:	COB Representatives: Present: Chen, Vogel Absent: None
Deans / AVPs: Present: d'Alarcao, Kaufman, Meth, Shillington Absent: None	EDUC Representatives: Present: Mathur, Munoz-Munoz Absent: None
Students: Present: Brown, Doshi, Gambarin, Guzman, Lacson Absent: Swaminathan	ENGR Representatives: Present: Sullivan-Green, Wong, Kao Absent: None
Alumni Representative: Absent: Vacant	H&A Representatives: Present: Frazier, Han, Kataoka, Lee, Sabalius Absent: Riley
Emeritus Representative: Present: Jochim Absent: None	SCI Representatives: Present: French, Heindl, Shaffer, Muller Absent: None
Honorary Representative: Present: Buzanski, Peter, Lessow-Hurley Absent: None	SOS Representatives: Present: Hart, Raman, Haverfield, Pinnell, Meniketti Absent: None
General Unit Representatives: Present: Flandez, Johnson, Masegian, Pendyala, Velarde Absent: None	

II. Land Acknowledgement:

Senator Estevan Guzman read the land acknowledgment.

III. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes:

A. Approval of Senate Minutes of April 15, 2024

The minutes were approved.

IV. Communications and Questions

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Sasikumar's update featured the following:

- A slideshow presentation to thank all those who helped the Senate this academic year, and farewell to the senators and student senators who are leaving the senate.
- A brief summary of all the accomplishments of the Senate this academic year, including a listing of all the policies passed by the Senate.
- In December, the Senate passed an amendment to the Constitution. The amendment was then sent to the entire faculty for a referendum, but it did not pass.
- This meeting will end at 4 p.m., and we will have a brief break for those staying for the next meeting. We will then reconvene for the first meeting of the new Senate.

B. From the President:

The President had previously shared her slide deck in the interest of time so she could start with any questions.

C: You noted that fundraising is on track.

A: Yes, we have an annual goal of \$ 30 million this year, and we are almost at \$ 21 million. We are ahead of last year and on track as we move forward with the remainder of the academic year.

Q: Will the honorary doctorate nominees be announced on a campus level?

A: A campus announcement regarding those individuals will be forthcoming.

Q: What are the President's thoughts on the budget situation?

A: I think my answer to that is that it depends. At this moment, it depends on our enrollment growth and our support from the state. The House, Senate, and the governor have continued supporting the compact's honoring. That does provide us some stability in our finances and how we think about our future. Our enrollment continues to rebound most positively across all categories, including transfer students. We continue to work towards building our enrollment back to pre-pandemic levels, providing significant additional revenue. It is a difficult time for every division in the university. And I understand your concern about the push-pull of class sizing class sizes as well as the number of course offerings. We are working towards improvement in that area, but right now, my primary focus is to provide a fiscally sustainable budget, and to do that, we have to reduce costs while we continue to grow revenues because we don't have a reserve to draw from to plug holes.

Q: What is the plan to provide first-year support on campus?

A: The campus is committed to first-year student success. We're looking at all of our academic programs, from pre- to orientation to the support networks and holistic support networks that support first-year students. It continues to be a priority. It's one of the areas that I'm also talking with funders about on a daily basis to enhance more support for some of the co-curricular activities that we know enhance student success.

C:(Provost) AB928 update. We were given some one-time money. They did a baseline for every campus, and based on the number of programs, we have almost the largest number of undergraduate programs in the system. So we ended up with more money. Part of this is a timeline issue because we have to pass a GE change in the Senate that affects next year's catalog. So, the money goes almost exclusively into faculty support because that is where much of this work must be done. So there's some money set aside for a group appointed by the Senate Exec to look at what GE changes have to happen, and they will work over the summer. The timeline will be tight: we have to finish by October to impact the catalog for 24-25.

C:(Provost) I am for a first-year experience. Some colleges already have it, but I'm not sure a campus-wide first experience would ever get through. It's also not a General Education requirement because education is generally dictated by Title V in the system, but it could be a university requirement. So I would just caution us not to muddle the 1st year experience with General Education, although they obviously intersect.

Q: Do you have a process in mind for the college curriculum?

A: If I'm coming from a high unit major, such as Engineering, then I imagine that the current curriculum team may have a particular view about how they would probably use the extra unit. We will engage them in workshops or some other things to think about. Again, I'm wide open.

Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

Executive Committee Minutes of April 8, 2024- no questions

Executive Committee Minutes of April 22, 2024- no questions

Executive Committee Minutes of April 29, 2024- no questions

B. Consent Calendar: No Consent Calendar

C. Executive Committee Action Items: Committee on Senate Representation

Senator Kataoka, Senator Munoz-Munoz, and Harish Chander Presented AS 1876 Amendment to the Constitution of the Academic Senate of San José State University, and AS 1877 Amendment to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate of San José State University (First Reading)

The committee drafted these amendments after meeting with stakeholders, conducting a staff survey, and looking at past referrals. After this research, the committee focused on staff representation in the senate.

Questions:

Q: Will the committee change “he or she” to “they” in the Bylaws?

A: Yes, we will do so.

Q: Can you clarify how the number of faculty and non-faculty members changes?

A: Currently, there are 36 faculty members and 18 non-faculty members. Of the 36, when there is a past chair like this year, 31 are elected members. With the proposal, in such a year the number of elected faculty senators would be 35.

Q: What is the current number of senators, and how would that number change?

A: The current number is 54. This number would be 60.

Q: The current proposal delineates the four staff senators into 2 SSP Staff and 2 General Staff senators. Could more than two senators from one group be considered?

A: We wanted to clearly separate the two electorates. We feel that a model that says at least two would be SSP/General Staff members would conflate these electorates. We would like to hear any suggestions for implementing more than two members from each group.

Q: Will the proposal also extend the eligibility to SSP I and II members?

A: Yes.

C: I’m concerned that the proposal would reduce the number of SSP senators. These members are very knowledgeable. I don’t want these people not to have opportunities.

A: There are about 2000 staff members and 170 SSPs, so SSP members are more represented, but we will take your point and bring it back to the committee to discuss it further.

Q: To clarify, the General Unit will still exist, right?

A: The members of the General Unit will be in the faculty electorate. There will be a separate SSP electorate; the new SSP senators could be from SSP I to IV members.

Q: General Staff senators may come from any division, correct?

A: Yes.

Ct: Bylaws note that Staff senators can serve on General Unit seats on committees. It’s unclear to me why members can take committee seats for the electorate they are not members of. Why are they able to cross the electorate?

A: The general idea is to allow staff senators to fulfill their duty as senators and serve on policy committees. If Staff members serve on policy committees, they

should also be able to serve on other non-policy committees. However, the language is unclear so this point will be returned to the committee.

V. Unfinished Business:

Senator Multani Presented *Sense of the Senate, AS 1871, Reaffirming Freedom of Speech and Expression, Promoting Respectful and Civil Dialogue in our Campus Community (Final Reading)*

Senator Multani stated In our last meeting, the concern of mentioning specific dates and times of incidents was brought up. I have found examples of other SoS where specific dates and times are included. Since we have already included these details, I don't find applying the same practice for this Sense of the Senate problematic.

Questions:

C: I find it very inappropriate to pinpoint an incident where we do not know all the facts yet. The investigation is still ongoing

A: It is important to keep this information in. Yes, it is currently being investigated, but all that is stated are the facts we already know. It does not point any fingers. It is important for the context of this Sense of Senate. Students might know what it relates to right now because it recently happened, but those reading it in the future would not have clarification on the incident that happened.

C: I agree this part needs to be included in the Sense of Senate. What is included is what was already in the President's message following the incident, and from students who have come forward. If the administration can send out a message acknowledging the incidents, it should be able to be included in the Sense of Senate.

C: It is now May, and we know much more than in February. It was not just one incident between only one professor and one student but multiple professors and students, and so taking out the phrase doesn't delete the poignancy of the issue, that there was a serious incident in Sweeney Hall. So, I appreciate that the focus is on the one thing that happened, but many things went on that day. This is all a part of the larger conversation about where we go and how we heal as a campus.

There was an amendment to remove the word 'serious', but it did not pass.

C: As a member of the CFA leadership on this campus, I know full well that it's very important to protect the rights of faculty members, especially during the period where their status on campus may be affected and there are questions about their professional behavior. 2,500 students have been arrested in the past month because of protests. There will be questions in the course of human events. What happened on this campus? We can change the wording, but we can't lose that date.

The Sense of Senate passed 31-0-5

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

A. University Library Board (ULB): No Report

B. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

Senator French presented AS 1870, Modification to S94-5/F95-1 Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (Final Reading)

Senator French explained that the changes that were made are highlighted in the amendment. The committee made substantial changes in response to feedback from the Senate and in collaboration with University Personnel (UP). A significant change was in response to the Senate feeling strongly that representation from lecturers was important on the board, so we updated the membership to include senior lecturers and associate professors, but the majority are still to be tenured, full professors. In consultation with UP, we clarified and streamlined the language about how complaints would be referred to the board. We emphasized the board's role in providing consultation and seeking informal resolution. In response to concerns from the Provost and UP, we changed the communication of the Findings section to mirror the Research Integrity policy, and to require the board to make a recommendation to the president when an informal resolution is not possible. We also removed references from the board carrying out investigations. Finally, we added language requiring the training of board members.

C: Since the board was created a quarter century ago, the policy has been 25 years in the making. We have revised our ethics policy and professional responsibility policy, but we now need a mechanism for implementing those provisions. I think this is a compromise, and it's a workable compromise that has been worked out between the professional standards committee, and key members of the administration who understand how these things work.

The policy passed 33-0-3

Senator French presented AS 1875, Amendment M to University Policy S15-7, Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Procedures (Final Reading)

Senator French explained that this was a final reading, since it was anticipated to be non-controversial. This amendment is designed to make it easier to staff the university RTP committee by allowing faculty who are on leave during the fall semester but on duty during the spring semester to be appointed to that committee.

The amendment passed 38-0-0

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

Senator Sullivan-Green presented AS 1872, Amendment A to S17-1, University Policy, Culminating Activities and Final Examinations Policy (Final Reading)

Senator Sullivan-Green stated that since the last reading, the committee has updated the Whereas statements and the Resolved statements. Also, some language has been

added to distinguish between the culminating activity period, which is the portion of The semester is committed to culminating activities and final examinations, and then the individual two-hour sessions will be referred to as the culminating activity sessions. We also discussed feedback that we received from UCCD.

C: This proposed amendment is consistent with the final examination or culminating experience periods of almost every other university in the system.

The amendment passed 38-0-0

Senator Sullivan-Green presented AS 1873, University Policy, Student Advising and Holistic Student Support Services Policy (Final Reading)

Senator Sullivan-Green: Since our first reading, we have updated our Whereas and Resolved clauses, and included the background to add perspective on where the policy started and ended. We also responded to, and discussed feedback, that we received from UCCD and several senators, after the first reading. No significant changes were made to the policy.

Questions:

C: Was there consultation with the various stakeholders on campus?

A: We have consulted with various students, staff, faculty, and administrators.

C: How exactly is advising defined in the policy?

A: Instead of trying to describe every component of academic advising that would deal with things such as choosing classes, applying for graduation, and former students returning, we used the term academic advising—where the goal is to get the students to complete their academic portion of their educational journey. Components may vary from department to department and program to program. This is a policy of principle as opposed to a policy that has direct activities that have to be done under it.

The policy was passed 32-1-3

D. Organization and Government Committee (O&G): No Report

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

Senator Hiu Yung Wong presented AS 1874, University Policy, Organization of the Academic Planning Process at San Jose State University (First Reading)

This is a first reading to bring to the attention of the body, the change that is proposed. There will be no vote.

The change is from program planning to academic planning to reflect a better holistic review process. The membership has been made more flexible, and we have moved Sections 6 and 7, in which the program planning process was described. The main change is that from now on, you are trusting the Curriculum and Research Committee and the Program Planning Committee to be in charge of the review process details. It will not be brought back to the Senate for a general vote.

Questions:

C: Does the change to the academic planning process mean that you only look at programs within an academic department? What is the guidance for General Education?

A: GE is now treated as a program. So, there's a programmatic assessment of GE in the campus. That's happening through Undergraduate Education right now.

VII. Special Committee Reports: None

VIII. New Business: None

IX. State of the University Announcements: None

- a. Chief Diversity Officer
- b. Vice President for Student Affairs
- c. Provost
- d. Vice President for
Administration and Finance
- e. Associated Students President
- f. CSU Statewide Representative(s)

X. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.