

SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE
2020/2021
Agenda

December 7, 2020, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm
via Zoom: <https://sjsu.zoom.us/j/93572017118>

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

- I. **Call to Order and Roll Call:**
- II. **Land Acknowledgement:**
- III. **Approval of Minutes:**
Senate Minutes of November 9, 2020
- IV. **Communications and Questions:**
 - A. From the Chair of the Senate
 - B. From the President of the University
- V. **Executive Committee Report:**
 - A. Minutes of the Executive Committee –
EC Minutes of November 2, 2020
EC Minutes of November 16, 2020
EC Minutes of November 23, 2020
 - B. Consent Calendar –
Consent Calendar of December 7, 2020
 - C. Executive Committee Action Items –
- VI. **Unfinished Business:**
- VII. **Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation)**
 - A. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
AS 1798, Amendment C to University Policy S14-5, Guidelines for General Education (GE), American Institutions (AI), and the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) (Final Reading)

AS 1791, Policy Recommendation, Accessibility in Curricular Materials (First Reading)
 - B. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA)
AS 1787, Policy Recommendation, Adding Classes After Advance Registration (Final Reading).

AS 1792, Sense of the Senate Resolution, On Continued Maximum Flexibility and Support of SJSU Students During the Prolonged COVID-19 Pandemic (Final Reading)

AS 1793, Policy Recommendation, Amendment C to University Policy S16-16, Probation and Disqualification, Temporary Amendment due to the COVID-19 Pandemic (Final Reading)

C. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

AS 1794, Amendment D to University Policy S15-8, Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and Standards, Deleting an obsolete reference (Final Reading)

AS 1796, Amendment C to University Policy S15-6, Appointment of Regular Faculty Employees, Deleting an obsolete reference (Final Reading)

AS 1797, Amendment D to University Policy S15-6, Appointment of Regular Faculty Employees, Defining Joint Appointments in Appointment Letters (First Reading)

AS 1795, Amendment J to University Policy S15-7 Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Procedures, RTP Procedures for Joint Appointments (First Reading)

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

AS 1790, Amendment to Standing Rule 7a, Inclusion of Land Acknowledgement in Academic Senate Agenda (First Reading)

E. University Library Board (ULB):

VIII. Special Committee Reports:

- a. Update from the Committee on Professional, Productive, and Ethical Expectations in Work Relations by CDO Kathy Wong(Lau) and Vice Chair Alison McKee, **Time Certain: 3:50 p.m.**
- b. Report from Athletics, the Athletics Board, and the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) by Marie Tuite, Athletics Director and Tamar Semerjian, **Time Certain: 4:00 p.m.**

IX. New Business:

X. State of the University Announcements:

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

XI. Adjournment

2020-2021 Academic Senate Minutes
November 9, 2020

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

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

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

III. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–
 The minutes of October 12, 2020 and October 26, 2020 were approved (42-0-1).

IV. Communications and Questions –
A. From the Chair of the Senate:

This meeting will be recorded for purposes of transcribing the minutes. Only the Senate Administrator and Chair Mathur review it.

Be sure that your full name is shown in your participant listing. Use the chat window for communication. Please ensure you mute when not speaking. If you are having bandwidth issues, please consider stopping your video. Type SL into chat if you have a question or an amendment. If we are in debate, please type SL-Amendment or SL-Debate for the speaker's list. Wait until the senate chair calls on you. Do not post your questions in the chat unless requested. We will vote using the polling feature, only vote if you are a senator. Please note that the Chair can see your private chats in the chat feature.

Chair Mathur commented on what a stressful and anxious week it has been with the elections during the pandemic. Chair Mathur echoed the comments from the President and Provost about what a fantastic campus community it is that we work in and the importance of continuing to provide support and space to one another as we transition as a country. We do need to pay attention to what has come out of this election and to recognize the 'gems.' We had a historic turnout of voters, massive early voting, 100 million people. Young people registered to vote in record numbers, in 32 states across the country, more young people registered to vote in October 2020 compared to November 2016. In Idaho, Georgia, Minnesota, and Vermont youth voter registration numbers exceeded those in 2016 by more than 1/3rd. In the 2018 mid-term elections, about 58% of poll workers were age 61 or older. A group at higher risk for COVID. This time around many older workers were reluctant to work the polls. This election high school students and young adults filled in those crucial rolls to keep democracy running. More than 37,000 young people signed up to be poll workers.

Americans really came together with a stronger sense of community. Nowhere was this more obvious than on our campus with the post-election programming done by the committee headed by the Chief Diversity Officer, Vice President for Student Affairs, and Director of State and Local Relations, in terms of voter registration and support. The tremendous work done by Associated Students and students across our campus has been amazing. Native American and indigenous people who were denied the vote for decades, came together in record numbers and many have noted that their votes turned the tide of the election in many states. For the first time in history, the U.S. House of Representatives will have three Native American women amongst its members. In Delaware, the nation's first transgender person was elected to the Senate. A record number of LGBTQ lawmakers will be headed to congress in the next session.

Also, Kamala Devi Harris has risen in national politics higher than any other woman in U.S. history. She has really broken the glass ceiling. There is much work to be done, but for now let us be thankful and celebrate all of these

gems. Chair Mathur is thankful and feels gratitude for the support and collegiality she has seen around our campus, it has been inspiring. Chair Mathur is proud to be a member of the Senate and the University. Kudos to the post-election team as well as many senators in this room, Senator Delgadillo, Senator Yang, Senator Day, and Senator Wong(Lau). The Senate gave a round of applause.

Chair Mathur thanked our veterans for their service. Veterans make sacrifices for the common good, fought for our freedoms. Without the service of veterans, we would not always have the freedoms that we have.

Reminders, the Faculty Trustee nominations are due to the Senate by November 20, 2020. Also, if you are interested in serving on the American Institutions General Education Review Panels, those nominations are due by November 13, 2020.

B. From the President:

President Papazian commented that she would like to echo VP Anagnos' comments about the glass ceiling, but it isn't broken just cracked. There is still more work to do in that area. We need to remember that while a majority of the popular vote, and 2/3rds of California, voted for the President-elect, the second largest number in U.S. history voted for the incumbent president. This still remains a very divided country in many regards. Which is interesting, because if you look at the policies that both groups would like to pass, they are in more agreement than the vote shows. Think about that. There is a lot of presence of California values in our federal government and it matters. We need to find a way across these divides. It will be important to have those conversations and show leadership in bridging those divides. Our own congressman, Rohit Khanna, proposed a \$900 billion initiative to create science and technology jobs. We need to find a way to get science and technology education out to rural areas. We need to start developing a curriculum around digital economy in places that we haven't traditionally seen it. Think about what we can do as partners with other universities and the community colleges. There is a role for SJSU in this, with our faculty in those programs, computer science and engineering and in other liberal arts programs as well. There may be a role for faculty exchanges where our expertise can be put to service to generate a healthier economy. This is something to think about, there are many opportunities. Alongside of that think about partnerships like with Michigan where they know how to build cars and here we know how to automate, electrify, and all that. Good intersections for our students.

There will be a new administration coming in. President Papazian does think we will see a federal stimulus bill of some kind. Many agencies in Washington are already working with the house and the senate on this. The President is hopeful this will happen before the inauguration, but confident it will happen

after the inauguration. We should find a little relief for our students and some relief for small businesses. The president isn't sure what will happen with regard to the Affordable Care Act.

Our Campus Climate townhall meetings are set for later this week. The president encouraged people to register for them on November 12 and 13, 2020. This is an important campus-wide conversation. The President and CDO will then begin putting together the Committee on Diversity and Inclusion in response to what we learn there as well as other issues.

The Early Exit program deadline from University Personnel is next Monday. It is a pretty clear set of criteria. If you meet the eligibility, then you are eligible.

Our new Spartan Athletic Center on South Campus is on the Board of Trustee's Agenda for next week. We are optimistic that will go through smoothly.

Questions:

Q: You mentioned that with the new administration that there may be a new stimulus package, can you speak to this?

A: I think the best case scenario to start with is the Heroes' Act that passed the house. That would be significant. It is a \$3 trillion dollar package. I do not think we will see that. I think it will be a fight to get it up to \$3 trillion. What I think will probably happen is a smaller package in the short term, and then a subsequent stimulus package after the new administration takes over. The amount will probably depend on the outcome of the election. There is recognition that higher education has taken a huge hit in all this and needs state support. It is a question of whether you do a head count or FTE. Community colleges are pushing for headcount since they have those numbers, but not the FTE. FTE is being pushed by fulltime institutions since a lot of the loss of dollars is in housing. You don't have those kind of losses that are COVID-related in community colleges. There should also be some dollars to support the research enterprise, so we should see a benefit there of some kind since we are active there. Whether there will be some support for the states is still out there. The governors are working hard to see that happens. That would be good for us, that would take the pressure off of campuses. There is a wide range of how this could go. What do you think Melinda Jackson and Ken Peter?

C: [Ken Peter] I don't think we will have any hard plans until the new administration is in place on January 5, 2020 until we have information on those Georgia seats.

C: [Melinda Jackson] I agree. Whether we will get any more cooperation out of the new congress is really up in the air. We are keeping our fingers crossed.

Q: Are part-time lecturer faculty eligible for the Early Exit Program? Can you clarify?

A: I'm going to defer to Joanne Wright.

C: [Joanne Wright] The 1.0, 3-year entitled faculty are eligible.

Q: So, not part-time?

A: That is correct.

Q: Last week, Chancellor White presented a view of what the CSU might look like post pandemic which increases the amount of online classes. My question is that for the past five years we've heard that enrollments in the CSU will start decreasing over the next five years, and we will be in a budget recovery period. How does that tie in and what are we doing to re-envision where SJSU is then?

A: It is a great question. In terms of online classes, we are all trying to figure out what that will look like over the next few years. My opinion is that it will be more hybrid than online. I think you will see some things work well in online and then there are other things that don't work well online. I think it is important we learn the right lessons. Where we can expand outreach that will be a good thing. We've long known that 2025 is a plateau space where the number of HS graduates would drop off. Due to the pandemic, we know that there are a very large number of working adults, or adults who were working that have some college but no degree. The question is how do we reach out to those people? One of the benefits of the online classes is that it does reach out to those people. There is a positive in that when you have employees who have been displaced. Not all of those jobs will come back. We have an opportunity here to help people finish their degree, or to move forward with another degree. Or stackable certificates which will enable them to get particular jobs. I'll defer to the Vice President of Student Affairs here. We also have to look at our graduate enrollment. We should also look at what we can offer in the professional areas and Dean d'Alarcao is looking into this. We also need to pay a lot of attention to the international side. There is some relief at least with the new administration on the VISA issues. I think some of these issues will be addressed on day 1. Once students start to find their way to other institutions, it is very hard to bring them back. We had a robust international student population. We are going to continue working on this. Our College of Professional and Global Education is doing good work on this.

C: [VP Day] Absolutely, we have to consider what the hybrid future looks like. There is a lot of information coming out that suggests students want lots of options between online and hybrid. We are also more than likely going to see more transfer students than Frosh. We are already seeing a softening in that population largely due to community college enrollments. The fact that community college students can be enrolled for free. That is okay. We also need to pay more attention to our out-of-state opportunities. We need to think about how, where, and when we deliver our programs. Online is just once piece of the conversation.

Q: You have said you are returning the recent SOTES amendment, which is not the same as vetoing it. Given that the CSU has passed a resolution suspending the SOTES for the fall, can you give us an update on this?

A: Sending it back is a way of saying I'm not signing it, but it will have comments on there about why. I don't anticipate signing it. We did have a pretty robust discussion in the Senate on this. For me, the student voice is an important voice and I just don't see taking the student voice out of it. This is one piece of a larger picture. Students understand the challenge of modalities, but they have a lot of other things to say that need to be part of the record. There are other ways that faculty can speak to the particular issues or challenges that they may have like the provost's letter.

Q: What degree of assurance can you give to our dreamers with the new administration?

A: How things are addressed in congress really depends on what congress looks like. However, I have no doubt that the president-elect will support the dreamer. He was a part of creating that in the first place and I see no reason he wouldn't be supportive of that.

Q: Given the very stressful semester some of our students are facing at home, shouldn't we offer pass or no pass?

A: I am going to defer that question to Chair Mathur.

A: [Mathur] In our system we don't have a pass/no pass option, but we do have a credit/no credit option. There have been large conversations around the system regarding this issue. This time around students had more knowledge about the modalities and what they were going to get when they signed up for fall. Also, there has been significant training opportunity for faculty. Students already have the option of taking credit or no credit at the beginning of a class. We were also much better prepared for fall than we were for spring, so there has been no movement forward on credit/no credit. This doesn't mean that the conversation shouldn't continue on our campus.

C: Even though students may have been prepared for Fall, I'm seeing that students are extremely, extremely fatigued by a variety of other things. I think that it is really important that we have some conversations around what we can do to alleviate some of the stresses students have. The stresses haven't gone away. They have gotten worse.

A: [Papazian] I really appreciate the comments. I know the CDO has had some conversations with students and it is really clear there is a lot of stress across the institution. VP Day can speak to some of the ways they are addressing this for students. This is a real issue and a serious issue, and you are right it is multi-layered. It isn't in one place. Thank you very much for this comment. I appreciate it.

V. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

EC Minutes of October 5, 2020 – No questions

EC Minutes of October 19, 2020 – No questions

B. Consent Calendar:

Consent Calendar of November 9, 2020—There was no dissent to the consent calendar as presented by AVC Marachi.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

Senator Sen presented a motion to suspend the rules under Standing Rule 10c in order to present a resolution from the floor of the Senate. The motion was seconded by Senator Yang. The Senate voted and motion passed with more than a two-thirds majority (39-2-1).

Senators Sen and Yang presented ***Sense of the Senate Resolution, Condemning Anti-Black Racism and Systemic Racism and Calling for SJSU Academic Senate Actions to Promote Racial Equity (Final Reading)***. Several senators spoke in favor of this resolution noting that it is important for the senate to examine itself, in particular there is a value of the Speaker's Series to illuminate parts of SJSU history. It was also noted that the reflective approach is important for the Academic Senate and that this is a moment of truth and reconciliation. This resolution talks about anti-racism and racism in a systemic historical way and ties it to organizational culture. It is self-critical but also provides a structure. Not just a critique, resolved some actions in a way that academic institutions are poised to do. This is a proud document for SJSU, naming this publicly and a courageous one.

Q: Has anyone looked at the diversity of the Senate compared to the diversity of our faculty as a whole?

A: [Sasikumar] O&G is currently collecting that data. We should have it very soon.

The Senate voted and the resolution passed as written (46-0-1).

Senator White presented a motion to suspend the rules under Standing Rule 10c in order to allow Senator Curry to present a resolution from the floor of the Senate. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and motion passed with more than a two-thirds majority (37-2-4).

Senator Curry presented ***Sense of the Senate Resolution, Opposing the Chancellor's Implementation Process for AB 1460 (Final Reading)***.

Senators noted that it is a time to celebrate this requirement for the campuses. Resolution was built on the accomplishments of many faculty on our campus and beyond. We are joining many other campuses in proposing this resolution. It was noted that a similar debate occurred in early 1990s, solution is campus autonomy, many options that our campus can manage on our own. Concerns about growing curricular overreach of the Chancellor's office. Good that students were included in the conversation on our campus.

Q: How does this resolution address the tension between AB1460 and SB1440?

A: This resolution doesn't address that tension specifically. Part of this concerns the CO moving forward while 1460 was still being considered. Board of Trustees brought this upon themselves. The BOT proposed only one solution.

The Senate voted and the resolution passed as written (34-1-9).

VI. Unfinished Business: None.

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

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

Senator Sullivan-Green presented ***AS 1785, Policy Recommendation, Amendment B to University Policy S17-13, Undergraduate Student Honors at SJSU (Final Reading)***. **The Senate voted and AS 1785 passed as written (38-0-5).**

Senator Sullivan-Green presented ***AS 1787, Policy Recommendation, Adding Classes after Advance Registration (First Reading)***. Senator Sullivan-Green noted that pages 4-11 should be omitted. These pages were submitted to the Senate Office in error and were a carryover from the last reading. As many of you are aware, the university modified their use of waitlists for Fall 2020 due to the challenge of getting students into courses that are online only. That change allowed the waitlist to be active for a certain period of time after the start of the semester as well as raising all the graduating seniors to the top of the list. The reason that has not been done continuously is that our current version of Peoplesoft was not designed to allow that to be done on a continuous basis. This policy in part rescinds S93-7, which references touchtone registration and is no longer utilized. It is also the policy that references allowing graduating seniors to be given highest priority when adding classes after advanced registration. This policy provides guidelines to be used for the waitlist in future semesters. In particular, it defines the use of the waitlist, and how long the waitlist would remain active after the first day of instruction. It also allows departments to opt out of using the waitlist for certain courses given that we know this is not a one-size-fits-all solution. It is emphasized that graduating seniors would continue to be given the highest priority. Again, this is what we took out of S93-7. It also defines the situations where the waitlist would not be used to automatically enroll a student in a course if they happen to not satisfy certain conditions. For instance, if they are enrolled in another section of the course, if they have a time conflict with the course, or they will exceed the allowable number of units that may apply to them for a variety of circumstances.

Questions:

Q: How does the creation of this new policy address the concerns that are acknowledged in the first whereas clause? It would seem to me that if all the sections are at maximum enrollment, you will still have 100 students on the

waitlist that are not going to get in that class to graduate. It seems to me that part of the problem is not having enough classes to begin with and I don't really see how this policy addresses that?

A: This policy is just recognizing that classes may be full and that there may not be sufficient seats, but it doesn't necessarily define that it is required that we have additional sections. We know that many programs and many chairs make decisions about adding students over the enrollment caps that are published. We are just recognizing that there may be a scenario where students are trying enroll and they can't be accommodated during advanced registration. Perhaps, it might be better to rephrase that so that it says there may be insufficient seats during advanced registration.

Q: Would the committee consider making this policy stronger by not allowing departments to opt out of cancelling waitlists, especially for classes that instructors have historically intentionally lowered their class sizes to prevent students from getting into classes?

A: We can take that under consideration.

Q: In your introduction you mentioned waitlists for classes that are taught online, yet this policy pertains to all courses correct?

A: Right, that is what prompted this change.

Q: On the priority orders, that is an order carried over from the older policy and is not redundant with other policies right now, is that correct?

A: Correct, there is a registration policy that defines how students would be allowed to register for classes. That is a separate policy and that policy deals with the before classes start and this one deals with as soon as classes start.

Q: So, where do you say that shall be on an ongoing basis, I think that could be implementation? I would be happier to see a policy that says these are the priorities, then if it turns out we end up with split registration lists where there are some seats being held only for graduating seniors, I won't care what the implementation looks like. I don't think it needs to be in the policy.

A: Okay. Thank you for that comment.

Q: So, this is a question about possibly making this a faculty option rather than a department option and let me explain the scenario as to why. If I'm teaching a class and on the first day of class I have them sign up to give speeches or various other things. I get everyone organized and started on their projects and then nine days later, without my knowledge, someone pops into my class because I didn't have to sign off on them adding the class. They might not realize they are at a terrible disadvantage and might not even be able to pass the class, unless they talk to me and get advised on how to go about signing up for the various assignments they need to do. I'm concerned that when students pop into a class unannounced and without permission from the individual faculty member, that the student is at a disadvantage. There needs to be some way for the faculty member to require that the student talk to the faculty member before they add in late. This wouldn't happen if they had to come to class and see the faculty member before they

could add, but it could happen if they are coming in nine days late. Could the committee talk about whether the length of time should be shortened, or whether there needs to be some instruction that the student must see the faculty member first, or perhaps there should be a faculty member option, or some other way of solving that problem?

A: I'd like to respond to two things. The first thing is that we really are discouraging the use of faculty in the request, because then that leads to greater inequity across multiple sections and courses. If it is a concern, then the faculty member could make that request to the chair. The second part is in response to the nine day time-period. That was heavily discussed. The information in this policy is based on a survey that was sent from Undergraduate Education to all department chairs, faculty, and advisers and by and large everybody had positive things to say about the waitlist and keeping it automated. We used the nine day time period, because we felt like it allowed for classes that were one day a week and allowed a little time after the first meeting to manage. There were also a number of complaints about SJSU allowing registration too far into the semester for the reasons you specified. It was felt that nine days was a balance of that. We also talked about possibly doing a 'best practices' type document that informs students that it is their responsibility to speak with the instructor if they are added to a course at a later point in time. However, you can always opt out of using the waitlist if you can't go through the department.

Q: Yes, but even faculty teaching sections of the same course use different assignments and have different requirements, so for some it wouldn't matter but for others it would.

A: Again, if you feel that way then you could ask to the department chair to go to Undergraduate Education and they would take that under advisement. We feel it is more appropriate to have it channeled through the department chair, than to have it individual faculty contacting Undergraduate Education.

Q: Has the committee realized just how grateful faculty are to have this waitlist? This is something they have been asking for over ten years and were told it couldn't be done, because of our contract with Peoplesoft.

A: We do recognize that this will require some reprogramming of Peoplesoft, because the current version does not allow it, and has not historically allowed it. However, it is being done as we speak with the hopes of having it done for Spring 2021 as well. Many faculty expressed extreme satisfaction that this would be an option for them.

Q: Would the committee consider reframing some of the first whereas clauses to say that faculty have expressed this satisfaction with workload?

A: We said in the last row that faculty spend a significant amount of time managing student enrollment after advance registration through the use of permission codes.

Q: In reading line 57, it looks like graduating seniors would include both undergraduate and graduate seniors is that correct?

A: Correct.

Q: Would the committee then consider changing the words “graduating senior” to “graduating student”?

A: We will take that under consideration. Thank you for that.

Q: My question is about communication with students about the waitlist. Situations arise where students are on the waitlist for a class that is essentially full for the entire nine-day period and think they are going to get in the class. Then comes day nine and they realize they aren’t going to get in and this creates a crisis. They are not really communicating with the faculty and it appears no one is communicating with them about not getting in the class. This would not occur if they were going to the class every day and they would see after a couple of days that they weren’t going to get in and could look for another class. Will the committee consider this?

A: In communicating with Undergraduate Education and Graduate Studies they have given us assurances that they will communicate better about what the expectations are for that waitlist. We also had instances where students were at the top of the waitlist and were passed over for the class because they had not satisfied one of the things listed in the policy. This is why we put in the policy that being at the top of the waitlist does not guarantee you will get a seat if there is a situation where your schedule will not permit it.

Q: How would this apply to students who want to retake a class?

A: In the other registration policy, it does talk allow first time repeat students to register or get on the waitlist at least three weeks before the start of the semester. These students will be treated appropriately once they get on that waitlist. If it is a multiple repeat situation, that would be handled in the manual manner with a form to the instructor requesting permission to take a course. This would only apply to first time repeaters.

Q: What if it is a graduating senior who just wants to repeat a course to get a better grade?

A: That would depend on the other policy we have that it does allow a repeat if the student received a grade lower than a “C.” If they received a grade higher than a “C,” the system will not allow them to retake the course because they passed it.

Q: Historically, once a course has started, it has moved from University control to the faculty member’s control. Having the department control the add codes sort of defeats the purpose of the faculty member having control on the first day. Unless the department maintains very close communication with the students, there could be a variety of issues as the nine days unfold. Has the committee considered this?

A: Again, when we sent out the survey, we had quite a few responses and the support for this was overwhelmingly positive. There are a number of departments that set aside a number of seats in each class for students that can’t get on the waitlist or can’t advance register for whatever reason.

Departments can do this. It is just a matter of communicating with the students.

C: I think it is very important that departments have the option of opting out. There are a number of complicated situations that we have with labs that can occur. I appreciate the fact that you have recognized this.

A: We were adamant that departments be able to opt out.

B. Professional Standards Committee (PS): None

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

Senator Sasikumar presented ***AS 1788, Policy Recommendation, Amendment B to University Policy, S18-15, Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Committee (ADAPC) to Update the Membership of the Committee (Final Reading).*** The Senate voted and AS 1788 passed as written (42-0-2).

Senator Sasikumar presented ***AS 1789, Senate Management Resolution, Amends SM-F15-4, Modification of the Graduate Studies and Research Committee (Final Reading).*** The Senate voted and AS 1789 passed as written (42-0-3).

D. University Library Board (ULB): None

E. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R)

VIII. State of the University Announcements:

A. Associated Students President:

Vice President Quock announced that AS had held student decompression sessions after the elections for students to either celebrate or grieve.

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

We continue to work with the county on a weekly basis and open up new areas of our campus. One area we are very frustrated with is dining. To me, the dining commons looks like a restaurant, smells like a restaurant, and most of the restaurants in Santa Clara County are open for limited dining with social distancing. However, the county has said no, we can't have our students eat in the dining commons. Students have to get their meals and take them to their rooms or an outdoor location to eat. We thought we had a path to open up the dining commons in a safe way, but the county has closed that down. Right before we got that news, we were going to be hosting Thanksgiving dinner in the dining commons, but right now it will be to go. We have a fair number of students in housing over the holiday and this will give them a chance to have a Thanksgiving dinner.

Q: In relation to dining commons, in terms of student employees have any of them been laid off?

A: Way back in March and April there were a number of students who were laid off and a number of full-time employees who were laid off due to changes in the dining commons.

Q: We do have a number of students, including foster youth who are actually on the campus year round. Is that correct?

A: Yes, that is why it is so important to do something I think during these holidays.

C. Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA):

Our enrollment applications for Spring 2021 continue to look strong in Frosh and Transfer areas. We are slightly down in graduates, but we are tightening up there and we are excited about it. I'm anticipating those numbers will continue to remain strong. We are continuing to see some course drops so we are doing some analysis on that to determine what is happening. We are looking at how many courses are being dropped, who those students are, and what kind of courses they are dropping. It seems that we have a phenomena occurring in which those students taking an above average unit load are dropping that extra course, which is significantly better than students who were full time dropping to part time in terms of unit load and financial aid. As you might imagine it isn't a huge surprise given this fall.

We are in a space where we cannot one-on-one counseling session ourselves out of the kind of mental health dynamics we find ourselves in in higher education. We are beyond that. There isn't a counseling unit anywhere in the U.S. that can meet the demand. However, we are in a space where we need to and have begun to expand our mental health services for students. Yes, we do continue to do the one-on-one counseling sessions and the emergency response sessions. We also have deployed two different apps to really try to create ways for students to self-help. We offer workshops and group psychotherapy. We continue to expand the ways in which students are engaging mental health services. This is a broader challenge and we are going to have to move to a public health level of approach, multi-pronged. We are going to have to speak to this across courses. We are going to have to speak to it at Orientation. We are going to have to address across our entire institution. Particularly, during COVID and with the elections, we are going to continue to see those kind of things, but I assure you we have a multi-prong way of connecting with students and we are connecting with thousands of students. It is an ongoing challenge. We will talk about this more at length when we have additional time to do so.

We are going to be creating engagement opportunities both for direct input as well as some public meetings with the Taskforce on Community Safety and Policing. You should be hearing about that in relatively short order. We are

finding and looking at data right now from across the institution as well as creating ways to give input on an individual basis.

After post-Thanksgiving, and in spring semester, our requirements around COVID testing have shifted, both here and in the state, and students will be required to be tested before returning to the residence halls. Thus far, we have been very fortunate and our COVID numbers have been relatively low, however, public health recommendations have shifted here and in the state. This is a slow tightening, but in an effort to keep our campus safe as safe as possible.

Questions:

Q: I'm wondering if any of the students are going to be staying in the dorms over Thanksgiving? Some of us have been helping students where we can and this is a particularly isolating holiday with COVID-19. When I was a graduate student, I had to handle a suicide attempt at the University of Texas during this time of year. I just wonder if there are going to be intervention or ways to address this.

A: The answer is yes. We will always have people who are going to remain in the dorms and we have staff who remain as well. There will continue to be ways for students to access services.

C: I just wanted to say that there is nothing like having human contact, even if it is socially distant, during the holidays. That was really what I was thinking of as opposed to telephone counseling. Thank you.

D. Chief Diversity Officer:

The Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ODEI) partnered with several different offices pre and post-election for sessions for staff and faculty. Through all of sessions what we heard is that there is a kind of secondary stress or anxiety by employees trying to support their students as well as facing the stresses of being at home and dealing with their own family as well moving everything to online. One of the greatest things people were seeking was how to stay connected both with their students and their colleagues. What employees are saying is that they miss running into other employees on campus and having that connection. We have offices on campus where we are going to start developing zoom rooms and drop-in rooms on campus where employees can show up. Last week when we had these post elections on campus, we had Empathia here. They were able to give us helpful hints on how to have dialogue, etc.

One thing that came out of the election response committee is a very good working relationship with UPD and our team of campus liaison folks who all worked very hard. A team of about 26 people showed up on campus to be supportive and were available to work with students (using COVID protocols of course). We developed a productive working relationship.

President Papazian already talked about the Campus Climate Town Hall Meetings and the announcement of the nominations for the campus Committee on Diversity and Inclusion, which will happen right after the town hall meetings and come out the following week.

E. CSU Faculty Trustee:

At the end of October, the BOT selected the presidents for both CSU East Bay and Northridge. For CSU East Bay we chose the current Chancellor of the University of Alaska-Anchorage. For Northridge we chose the current president of Channel Islands. Both presidents are women and now we have three female presidents in San Francisco, East Bay, and SJSU. I hope President Papazian will find them easy to work with. We now have 13 female presidents, and 9 male presidents with one seat being unfilled due to the vacancy in Channel Islands. This is 60% vs. 40%. Chancellor White mentioned that over half of the presidents are people of color, so we are extremely diverse at the leadership level.

Every September the Chancellor's Office presents the budget request to the BOT. They suggested that we ask for \$237.5 million in addition to our current funding. I was not satisfied with that. I suggested six or seven line items for additional funding. Just last Friday, the agenda for the BOT meeting for November was released. I was very pleased to find that the Chancellor's Office had increased the budget request to \$556 million. That is over \$300 million more than the September request. I take credit for this, because I was the only trustee that asks for additional funds. Will we get it? I don't know, but we will get nothing if we don't ask for it. Let's hope for the best. Most of all I hope these additional funds, if we get them, will be used to help avoid furloughs.

You can read more in my BOT report that will be sent to you in November.

F. Statewide Academic Senators:

We had a lively discussion with the Legislative Analyst's Office providing some feedback about things they might wish to consider. I will have a more detailed report in writing for you.

We did approve four resolutions, one of which is linked to subjects that have been addressed here. We approved a resolution 3440, which was Culturally Responsive Anti-Racist Mental Health Services and Well Being. This is intended not just for students only, but also for all SJSU employees as well recognizing the inequities and stresses people are facing throughout our society. Another resolution called for Consultation on Academic Implications of System-wide Fiscal Decisions. It called for a collegial decision making and shared governance between the ASCSU and relevant stakeholders. The ultimate resolution we passed was adopting the amended recommended Core Competencies for Ethnic Studies submitted on November 4, 2020. The

plenary extended beyond its closing time for one hour, and then there was a request for an emergency meeting this week to address the unresolved resolutions and includes some of the Ethnic Studies questions, because we wanted to have a voice to provide to our Faculty Trustee when he attends the BOT meeting, even if they cannot make a decision at this point.

Questions:

C: You may be aware that the system is being taken to court starting when we moved online in six class action lawsuits. As a result, the plaintiff has asked that all zoom recordings and materials be placed on a legal hold. This is something the legal counsels on both sides are discussing. Our legal counsel is asking that a protective order be put in place to prevent the loss of intellectual property rights, and to preserve privacy for faculty and students. I just wanted to make sure faculty and students were aware that all zoom recordings in LMS shells. can be requested by legal counsel.

Senator McKee presented a motion to extend the meeting for 10 minutes to allow for the rest of the updates from the Administrators. The motion was seconded by Senator Marachi. The Senate voted and the McKee motion passed.

G. Provost:

Provost Del Casino announced that we are moving quickly on WASC accreditation. There is a lot of data being collected. Pam Richardson is chair of that committee and has been doing a lot of work. I have two leadership hires out. One is for the Dean of the MLK Library and the other is for a Vice Provost of Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Analytics. The dean hire has come through. There is a very interesting and diverse group. We are in the middle of the Vice Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Analytics. If people have a chance, please see the open forums.

Out of the hiring process this past summer, the deans came up with some broad themes for how we think about hires in the future. They have been talking to their chairs about this. My goal is to get them out to the wider faculty community so people can really chew on these things, debate, and talk about these things.

The Honors Taskforce has been launched. From what I can see, there is a lot of great energy and good questions being raised. I'm excited to see what they come up with.

The second podcast I've been doing with faculty went out this week. There are several more coming out. I'm excited to just bounce around the campus and talk to faculty. I'm hoping to do a whole bunch more.

In the sixteen months I've been here there is a real elevation of the presence of our faculty in regional and national conversations. If you pay attention at all to the media, you can't go a day without seeing a SJSU person in the news now. I'll say a lot of that has to do with Robin in Strategic Communications who is very focused, but it is the faculty work and voice that is being represented out there. One of the other things I'm excited about is how do we elevate our faculty in the area of prestigious awards and fellowships. We had three people apply for Woodrow Wilson fellowships this year. We have several potential Carnegie fellows that we will apply for and I don't want to stop there. I think we need to be nominating our colleagues for Guggenheim. We have some outstanding faculty on this campus. I want to really create a conversation around these kinds of awards and then I think as a business model that teaches us how to manage them.

IX. Special Committee Reports:

Chair Mathur and Provost Del Casino presented the results of the campus-wide survey and feedback regarding the Executive Order on GE breadth to the Chancellor's Office. Chair Mathur thanked all the people who contributed to the report.

From the Chair:

There were 247 faculty and staff responses, and 282 undergraduate student responses. This is an amazing response rate given how quickly we had to respond. The key revisions proposed in the draft Executive Order included a reduction from 12 to 9 units in Area D. On our campus this means a reduction from 9 to 6 lower division units, we have three upper division units in Area D, called Area S. This revision definitely impacts our Area D dramatically.

The addition of an Area F, Ethnic Studies requirement would be a three-unit lower division education requirement. There was also a naming of Ethnic Studies Departments, and departments is underlined because this cuts out programs like our Asian-American Program, and our developing Native-American Studies Program. It did allow for other Ethnic Studies Department names like African-American Studies Department, but it did focus on Departments and not programs. Also, a concern for our campus is requiring two different disciplines for Area D requirements.

We sat down and looked at all the qualitative information that came in and I believe we had 40 to 50 pages of qualitative comments. We did an analysis and here are some of the exemplars about some of the concerns noted across the question. There were lots of concern about reducing Area D. The majority of faculty supported the Ethnic Studies requirement, but were very concerned about reducing Area D. In particular, this was because this is where our Political Science and Government areas are covered. There was a lot of concern over the requirement for two different disciplines in Area D. This would have a significant

impact on some of our Ethnic Studies sequences in area D, because it would require two different disciplines.

Our campus was strongly in support of including the word programs and not just focusing on departments. As an example, we are talking about programs like our Asian-American Studies. There was also some concern from some of the faculty about including other programs such as American and Jewish Studies programs.

There were pages and pages of concerns regarding implementation across the question. One of the key things that most of our faculty, staff, and students would like is to have more campus autonomy about implementation around the Ethnic Studies requirement and more flexibility to allow our campus to make the determination about how this requirement is met. People had different suggestions about how the requirement should be met. People were very clear that the curricular decision-making around Ethnic Studies should be made by the Ethnic Studies Department. People were very concerned about the overreach by the Chancellor's Office. This is just a sampling of comments that came in.

From the Provost:

What we did is structured a letter that started with the issues of autonomy and flexibility and framed that as much as humanly possible with where that is available, please provide us that. Again, we were the concerned about the focus on departments and not programs. Also, there was no need for the naming convention to be put in policy at all, since every campus can determine what they see as Ethnic Studies and that should be determined by the Ethnic Studies faculty. There was general concern about overreach, implementation, and the reduction in units. Fall 2021 implementation is not completely necessary, because after we reread things, it says the courses must be delivered in the first year, which could mean Spring 2022 where we might offer our first courses. This takes some of the pressure off when we might offer the courses. Then there was overall confusion about the different messaging of the requirement. So, in summary we request they expand the Executive Order to allow for inclusion of programs. Take out the requirement on two different disciplines and let the campuses figure that out. Allow for flexibility and autonomy to determine how the requirement should be met. There was also feedback that went directly to the Chancellor's Office from individual faculty.

Questions:

C: The ASCSU has been dealing with this since January of last year. AB 1460 very specifically requires a separate 3-unit course. The interaction between the law of Senate Bill 1440 and 440 and 1460 ends up putting pressure on the high-unit low flexibility majors. If not lower division GE then you end up with it being pushed into upper division in upper courses work. This is where the tension is. Looking for a better and more peaceful alternative doesn't appear exist.

Q: On the topic of consistency, were there any trends among students in the surveys that you noticed?

A: One of the trends was that there was a lot of confusion about how this would fit into general education. We also got a lot of responses from students in particular colleges who were concerned about putting this into upper division, because they did not want the requirement to take away from their major courses. We also saw comments from students about autonomy and the campus making the decisions as well.

Q: I'm assuming this has already been sent off to Long Beach and I'm wondering if you have any impression as to whether the feedback will be accorded importance and some kind of flexibility will emerge, or is your impression that feedback was requested to mollify the campuses?

A: I don't think the feedback was requested just to mollify the campuses, but I think there is some tension about how best to manage this so I don't know how much flexibility this will be given. However, knowing Loren, I'm sure he will pour over every page because that is the kind of person he is. What comes from that I don't actually know. I also don't know exactly what the other campuses submitted. Other campuses have already embedded the learning outcomes into general education and now we are waiting for the finalized executive order. Need to applaud the Senate and Senate leadership who have slowed things down on our campus to allow for conversations with ethnic studies faculty. [Mathur] We took a data-driven approach and I believe that makes our findings more robust since we can speak to the survey responses and campus concerns.

Q: I'm in the college of Engineering and there is a lot of concern about this area, because the way we maintain 120 units is through a D1 waiver for students that take AMS1A and 1B, so a D1 waiver isn't going to help us with the 120 units. Are there any thoughts about how we can keep 120 units in Engineering with the addition of the new Area F?

A: I don't know if we have an answer for that yet. We may have to go to 123 units. They may argue that this is against the law in AB 1460. Fortunately, there are many Engineering programs that are well above the 120 units. We got back to a place that many campuses didn't in Engineering. However, that might have to be a part of our overall conversation with the system.

C: At the ASCSU meeting last week, we heard that the new policy language around Ethnic Studies will be released sometime after the Board of Trustee's meeting next week. In addition, as Dr. Curry will be telling us later, one of the resolutions being considered at the last meeting was to formally take a position around the Ethnic Studies resolution itself and what the updated recommendation would be. We may be having an emergency meeting this week to address that.

From the Faculty Trustee:

Thank you for allowing me to give you the perspective of the Board of Trustees on this issue. In the spring, the ASCSU supported the inclusion of the Ethnic Studies requirement into lower division GE. In May, when the BOT's were presented with the Title V change, it included only two items. It included the creation of an Area F in the general education package of 3 units, and in order to lock into the general education units package, they introduced a cut to Area D from 12 units to 9 units. The BOT in July passed the Title V change at the Chancellor's Office recommendation. The inclusion in lower division GE was especially supported in order to maintain the transfer curriculum from community colleges according the law SB1440. Over the summer and then in early fall, more and more resistance developed among the faculty against the inclusion of precisely what the Senate had originally asked for and precisely what the Taskforce on Ethnic Studies had recommended in 2016 after long deliberations. Now the sentiment has changed and especially the Council on Ethnic Studies and the disciplinary faculty wanted to see the implementation as a freestanding graduation requirement. As the opposition of the faculty rose, the Chancellor's Office became more and more baffled as to the original intent of Shirley Weber and AB 1460 was that it should be placed in GE. Also, the law states the number of units for graduation shall not be increased. A program that now has 129 units will not go to 132 units, so the Chancellor's Office must remove 3 units somewhere. It was taken out of Social Sciences, as in most cases Ethnic Studies programs are in Social Sciences, and the thought was that it is the most likely group to get the most units so it was taken from that group. Over time we now have 18 campuses that have voiced opposition. However, the ASCSU did not take a position on it. I reminded the ASCSU that if they did not alter their position taken in March that Ethnic Studies should be included in lower division GE, it would remain the same. As a result of that comment, the ASCSU decided to hold an emergency meeting this week. I expect that the ASCSU will now articulate its opposition to including it in lower division GE. I will then be given the task of bringing this to the BOT. Tomorrow I have an agenda setting meeting with Loren Blanchard and his staff. There is reluctance on the part of the Chancellor's Office to take the requirement out of the lower division GE package and make it a freestanding graduation requirement, because two things will happen. First, it will have to be taken out of somewhere else, most likely the majors, without the majors being able to increase their total units to graduation by law. That might pose issues for accreditation. The second issue is that if campuses are given wide-ranging flexibility for implementation, then this battle will now be transferred to the 23 campuses. The individual campuses will have battles amongst their faculty. They are afraid that will create bigger problems. The Chancellor has to do what is right for all the campuses even if it is unpopular. Keep in mind when Ethnic Studies faculty felt that the Chancellor's office was not moving fast enough, they employed the legislature to enact legislation. Then it was taken out of Area D and the Social Science faculty came in and voiced their opposition. If we rescind and make it a free-standing requirement, will have opposition from faculty with high-unit majors. Even if the ASCSU passes a resolution, the soonest the BOT would be able to review would be March.

Questions:

C: I'm concerned about increasing to 123 units. There is a lot of opposition from students who are concerned already about graduating with 120 units.

C: The college of Engineering gave up a lot of units in our program to go to 120 units. At 120 units we are very much on the border of having enough technical units for accreditation. We are very concerned about accreditation issues with the addition of another three-unit course.

C: Under Title V, the 123 unit limit actually excludes high unit programs and Engineering is one of those it could be permissible to increase. In addition, American Institutions and GE waivers have been introduced for other programs across the system. There are alternatives, they are just ugly.

C: [Provost] Provost Del Casino encouraged faculty to read the comments. We need to wait and see what the system decides. The high impact majors are critical for us to understand. We have things on our campus that are unique to us such as our physical education units. Need to pay attention to all of the voices in this conversation. Our Ethnic Studies faculty are putting a lot of time and energy into this as well.

X. New Business: None

XI. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

Executive Committee Minutes
November 2, 2020
via Zoom, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

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

Absent: None

1. From the Chair:

Chair Mathur and the Executive Committee wished the CDO a Happy Birthday. Chair Mathur announced that there were quite a few nominations for the campus faculty awards and a few Wang Family Excellence Award nominations. However, this year's Wang Award nominees did not meet the eligibility criteria. A member noted that past campus faculty award recipients could be considered for the Wang Award in the analogous categories for the award.

2. The Executive Committee approved the consent agenda (Executive Committee Agenda of November 2, 2020, Executive Committee Minutes of October 19, 2020, and the Consent Calendar of November 2, 2020).

3. From the President:

President Papazian announced that the Elections Response Committee had been established and involves cross section of people from the university. One positive sign, as far as the elections are concerned, is that record numbers of young voters are voting. We hope students continue to learn about the importance of democracy from voting this year.

There was a special Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting last week to approve the two new Presidents of CSU East Bay and Northridge. Approval of our Spartan Athletic Center will come before the BOT in the November meeting. We will share the schematic design and hopefully get the go ahead.

Questions:

Q: There have been a couple of student deaths in one of the colleges. One was a student and one was an alumni. We have concerns about the mental health of our students. Can we get more mental health assistance and possibly some training for faculty to identify students at risk (and how to effectively connect them to the campus resources)?

A: Faculty play a critical role in identifying students at risk. Students will often reach out to faculty. There are a number of strategies we can use here.

C: This is a perennial challenge. This will take full scale mental health effort on campus. Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) is fully engaged. Our therapists are actively working with students. They are also present in Student Success Centers. We also implemented apps last year, and we increased group therapy. We are thrilled to hear faculty would like to attend training opportunities. There are some training programs that give models of students and what they might say. We are not utilizing this right now, but can incorporate moving forward. We need to get faculty and staff into orientation with CAPS.

A: We need to partner with the CDO and be mindful of the stress levels. Perhaps CSU Learn might have some resources we can use. The cabinet will look at this more and follow-up with the Executive Committee.

Q: There is a peaceful gathering of students scheduled for November 3, 2020 at 10th Street in front of the fraternities. Will UPD be respectful to students?

A: We are never interested in interrupting peaceful protest, but outside of campus grounds on the perimeter may pose some problems. For instance, there may be permit issues with the city, or if traffic is blocked there may be issues. SJSU has no plans to disrupt the protest.

C: No permits are allowed for large public gatherings at this time in Santa Clara County. Also, only

SJSU students, faculty, and staff are allowed on campus at this time. Whomever is planning this protest is strongly encouraged to research this further before moving forward with it due to these issues.

Q: A few people have raised concerns about dossiers and some security breaches. People are seeing faculty dossiers they shouldn't see via eFaculty, more this year than ever before. Also, the optional SOTES have been left in Personnel Action Files (PAF) and so may be considered in the review.

A: This is a question for the Provost. It sounds like an operational issue.

C: We have not heard of these breaches of confidentiality and will check into it. All SOTES go into the PAF. The only people that have access to the entire PAF are the President and Provost. I believe all the selected SOTES go into the working PAF or review.

C: The working PAF is the dossier and it excluded optional SOTES. I thought deans and department chairs had access to the PAF. We had the wife of a candidate put on his review committee. The problems have been corrected, but it was a rocky start.

A: That should not be happening. We will look at the process and fix it.

C: My impression was that it was a glitch and not intentional.

C: A lack of communication is causing problems. Lecturers and others are not having their emails responded to by Faculty Affairs.

C: I do know that Faculty Affairs lost a key player recently and that may be part of the problem.

4. From the Policy Committees:

a. From Instruction and Student Affairs (I&SA):

I&SA hopes to bring the Waitlist Policy to the Senate for a First Reading on November 9, 2020. I&SA sent out a survey and got feedback from the campus on the waitlist. We will be reviewing the results today. We also hope to rescind an old policy, S93-7, and move the only part of the policy that isn't out of date, graduating senior priority, to the new waitlist policy. We hope to bring a final reading to the Senate in December 2020.

I&SA is also working on a Grade Forgiveness and Grade Averaging policy. Currently, students can have 16 units of grade forgiveness with only 9 units in upper division courses. However, our Peoplesoft system cannot distinguish between lower and upper division courses. It just forgives 16 units. Executive Order 1037 does not specify upper or lower division, but we can be more stringent than the Executive Order. The question is do we amend the policy, or fix Peoplesoft?

C: We can fix Peoplesoft. We cannot let Peoplesoft drive our policy. I suggest you establish a small group of Senate leadership with Vice Provost Anagnos, the Provost, and CIO to brainstorm fixing this problem. The only other product out there besides Peoplesoft is Workday. I'm not convinced Workday is right for us.

b. From the Professional Standards Committee (PS):

PS will not have anything for the next Senate meeting on November 9, 2020.

PS is working on a draft lecturer policy. It is circulating with the lecturer council now and so far they have liked the changes. This policy clarifies the language regarding range elevations. This is a long term project.

The bargaining agreement contains language about external review. The most extensive language on external reviews comes from Long Beach. The idea behind the external review was to allow faculty who weren't in the mainstream to get their work evaluated and get credit for it. As an alternative to External Reviews, PS has been looking at universities with a Scholarship of Engagement category. PS will start this conversation today.

- c. From the Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
C&R has been working on establishing a General Education Review Panel (GRP) on American Institutions (AI). The Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, chair of the General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC), and the AVC reviewed the AI GRP composition (delineated in policy) and also reviewed the campus message. The call for nominations was sent out by the senate chair this morning.

C&R will delay any further work on the Ethnic Studies requirement until December. In the meantime, C&R is looking at program learning outcomes.

C&R has been working on two degree programs. The first one is the move is Hospitality Management into the College of Business. One issue that arose is whether lecturers would have a loss of entitlement with the move to business. This is an issue for CFA. However, the former Dean has committed the resources to the College of Business for three years. The program must grow in size by then.

C: There is a budget review whenever a program or department is moved. The funds will be kept separate until we see if the department grows in three years.

Other policies C&R are reviewing include a policy on accessibility that may come to the Senate for a First Reading on November 9, 2020, and a policy on First Year Experience Courses that will not come to the Senate until Spring 2021.

- d. From the Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
O&G is working on a Senate Management Resolution that would insert the Land Acknowledgement into the Senate Agenda. This should come to the Senate for a Final Reading on November 9, 2020.

C: Ryan Ward has several versions of the Land Acknowledgement that have been approved by the Muwekma Ohlone tribe.

O&G is also conducting research on expanding the number of seats and considering diversity on the Senate.

5. Updates From the University:

a. From the CSU Statewide Senator:

The second fall plenary meetings are this week. More work will be done regarding AB 1460 in preparation for the BOT meeting.

Senator Curry checked to see if the CSU Statewide Senate was meeting with the Council on Ethnic Studies and they are still uncertain. They want to remove more than just 'Social Justice' from Title V and they are also very disappointed about the lower division general education implementation of the graduation requirement.

Other policies include one on Emeritus status. Eight campuses do not have a policy.

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

Does anyone have any feedback on the budget presentation or other questions?

Questions:

Q: Chartwells shows an expenditure of \$7 million, isn't that high?

A: We normally expend about \$25 million on Chartwells, which includes the Dining Commons, and Food and Beverage across campus. The \$25 million pretty much equals the expense line. Chartwells isn't making much even in a normal year. With the library being closed as well as the markets, no football and concessions, Chartwells revenue is

substantially down.

Q: Are there fees we have to pay Chartwells as part of the contract we signed?

A: There is a \$400,000 management fee that was a part of the \$7 million expenditures.

Q: What is the return in a normal year?

A: We haven't had a normal year. In the past, Spartan Shops operated at a loss. Hopefully, Chartwells will make a small profit.

A: Food Service revenue is typically only 2%.

Q: Has there been any discussion across the CSU about reducing Category 2 fees? If that happens AS won't have a lot of money? How can we ensure that their reserves are protected?

A: We have no plans of reducing fees in Fall or Spring going forward. Going into Spring we look at excesses, and if there are any then we will look at what kind of reductions we could do. Reductions would be for Spring only, and one-time only. We haven't started our review yet. We will begin to look at category 2 fee units.

c. From Associated Students (AS):

AS will host decompression virtual spaces after the elections. Many AS students have participated in voter registration and other election initiatives.

AS Staff have attended dialogue training.

AS is hosting a political trivial game night.

d. From the Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA):

Enrollment is going well. Fall applications are up by 19%. Frosh applications are up 11%, and Transfer applications are up 5.6%. It is hard to tell what those numbers will mean for fall right now. Enrollments remain up for Spring 2020. However, work continues right up until Census Day. In January 2021, we will begin future enrollment conversations with the Executive Committee.

The Taskforce for Community Safety and Policing is being established. VP Day is currently the co-chairs. Edith Kinney is the other co-chair. There will be a website and portal link from the President's website. Racial Justice work is highlighted. This is an opportunity for people to engage in Community Safety and Policing.

Question:

Q: Do you have any sense of the increases in withdrawals this semester? I have seen students withdraw and disappear as a department chair.

A: I don't have the numbers now. I will give an update at the November 16, 2020 Executive Committee meeting.

e. From the Chief Diversity Officer (CDO):

The campus Elections Response Committee has 44 members. We have been working on pre-election, election day, and post-election programming. This includes safety and COVID safety. There will be staff, including the CDO's Office, on campus on election day should there be a mass-to-mass presence on campus. We have told UPD and San José Police that we value people over property. We are prepared post-election with workshops and Empathia counselors. We were surprised how many faculty were not familiar with the Red Folder.

There will be Campus Climate Townhalls on November 12 and 13, 2020 from 1 to 2:30 p.m.

and Rankin and Associates will present the findings from the survey. Open forums will be arranged for faculty, staff, and students after the holidays. The new year starts on January 27, 2021. We will have some forums in February 2021.

f. **From the Provost:**

The second podcast, *The Accidental Geographer*, launches today.

The big issue is managing AB 1460. We met and discussed how responses from the campus should be framed in regards to the Chancellor's office request for feedback on the draft Executive Order. The Provost is happy to share with the Executive Committee. The response just said where we are as a campus and the issues as we view them.

Questions

C: The findings will be shared at the next senate meeting.

C: Concerns were noted that the campus senate is serving as the proxy for the Chancellor's office message and implementation. This has led to some difficulty in making plans on our campus.

C: The senate has suggested a delay for campus implementation and to slow the process down. We have also made efforts to ensure that we collaborate with our ethnic studies faculty with the provost's support.

C: We will pause and see what the finalized executive order and Title 5 language is.

6. The meeting adjourned at 1:52 p.m.

\

These minutes were taken and transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on November 2, 2020. The minutes were reviewed by Chair Mathur on November 6, 2020. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on November 16, 2020.

Executive Committee Minutes
November 16, 2020
via Zoom, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

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

Absent: None

1. From the Chair:

The Taskforce on Community Safety and Policing will be coming to our next meeting, Monday, November 23, 2020.

From the Vice Chair:

The Senate Retreat will be held on February 12, 2021 via zoom. It will only be from 9 a.m. to noon. There will be no panels. There will be a few speakers and possibly some breakout groups with facilitators. Topics being considered include post-pandemic and the SJSU campus, supporting and retaining graduate students, teaching and learning, creating a sense of community and fighting burnout during and post pandemic.

Comments:

A member encouraged the Vice Chair to consider having student panels. They are quite valuable in getting student feedback.

2. The Executive Committee approved the consent agenda (Executive Committee Agenda of November 16, 2020, Executive Committee Minutes of November 2, 2020, and the Consent Calendar of November 16, 2020).

3. From the President:

The president will be sending out information this afternoon regarding the county health shift to the red tier. If the county moves to the purple tier, the president is also preparing that campus message.

4. From the Vice President of Administration and Finance (VPAF):

VP Faas gave an update on the Campus Master Plan Committee as aligned with the strategic plan. They are conducting stakeholder interviews across campus and looking at how to develop the campus while working towards our Transformation 2030 goals. This will be a yearlong process. When the pandemic ends we may find we do not need as much space as we have, if we continue with hybrid courses.

Questions:

Q: Are we moving back to the red tier level tomorrow and if so what does that mean for the campus?

A: We will not be all out closing like we did in March. We are much better positioned now. Also, the state guidelines gave higher education more flexibility than other businesses. Closing the campus and cancelling classes adds pressure to students in different areas like financial aid. We are adhering to the safety protocols we have in place.

5. From the AS President:

The community garden has been made more accessible for disabled students.

At the recent California State Student Association (CSSA) meeting, they passed a resolution on flexible grading options.

Questions:

Q: What was in the flexible grading resolution?

A: It asks for the Credit/No Credit option to be flexibly applied on campuses.

6. From the President of Student Affairs (VPSA):

Our enrollment looks good for spring. We are up 21% in applications, but we are down 9% in graduate students. Our intent to enroll numbers are at about 84%, our graduate numbers are also up. However, what is of concern is the number of drops from fall to spring.

As noted earlier, the Community Safety and Policing Taskforce has been invited to come to the Executive Committee and also will meeting with other groups. Getting faculty input is fantastic. This allows the taskforce to address any disconnects. Also, we can look at staffing needs relative to a public institution.

Question:

Q: Have we gotten input from the San José Police Department and what is their role in our process?

A: We will get their input in several ways. First, one of the faculty members is a former police officer. Secondly, we have a city council member on the taskforce. Lastly, we will have direct dialogue with their liaison to the taskforce and the university.

Q: AS has an operating agreement that the president must sign every year. Associated Students at other campuses have longer agreements. Some agreements go up to ten years. There are a lot of challenges getting this signed every year. Can we look into this?

A: How the auxiliaries operate is different at each campus. The broader question is how can we provide support, but give them their independence.

7. From the Chief Diversity Officer:

We are thrilled to announce that Dr. Patience Bryant will be joining the CDO's Office as the Director of Black/African American Equity.

Campus Climate Town Hall meetings were held on last Thursday and Friday. Rankin and Associates presented the information. It was very sobering. Issues for students included housing insecurity and low salary ranges. Faculty issues included equity. The CDO will be releasing the slides and recording from Rankin and Associates as soon as some technical difficulties with their move to the new website are fixed.

The CDO will be putting out a call for nominations for the Committee on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. Many people reviewed composition and role of the committee including the senate chair. You may self-nominate, or nominate someone else and should be appointed by January 2021.

The Election Response Committee finished up with the support meetings after the elections. One thing that people made very clear was that they missed having face-to-face interaction with their colleagues on campus. People miss the "small talk." The CDO will attempt to set something up to address this issue.

Questions:

Q: Have you heard anything about ruling regarding the lack of authority that the current acting Director of Homeland Security had regarding DACA?

A: We are so happy to see it. It is such a relief. The judge's ruling open up the door for 165,000 new DACA applications which were in a holding pattern.

Q: How were people selected for the standing committee?

A: They haven't been selected yet.

Q: Will there be an open call for nominations?

A: Yes.

Q: It has been two years since the Senate passed the bullying resolution. It sounds like about 5% to 10% of faculty have experienced bullying. What is the current status of the committee? Will they be doing a report to the senate on December 7th? What progress has been made?

A: We are meeting on a regular basis. We have an obligation to report to the President and the Senate by December 7, 2020 to give an update. The charge of the committee is slightly different than just bullying. The guidelines for student conduct appear to be far more extensive than the faculty guidelines. We are looking at those. We are also looking at policies that might be good resources.

C: People need to remember that changes at the national level won't happen immediately after January 21, 2021. For example, changes made with Title IX. It would be good if there was campus messaging about continued advocacy or continued needed supports and it provided where we can provide it.

Q: When does Dr. Bryant start?

A: December 7, 2021.

8. From the Provost:

COVID-19 is impacting our ability to complete searches. There have been some travel issues with Dean of the Library and the Vice Provost for Institutional Effectiveness searches.

We should hear where the CSU is at in the next 24 to 48 hours regarding AB 1460.

Other issues being discussed at the CSU level include the C/NC option. Data gathered at our campus was pulled from last spring. Ten percent of all grades were changed to C/NC. However, 72% of the grades that were changed were A's, B's, or C's. Once they were changed to C/NC they added nothing to the grade point average. Also, 35% of the 72% were A's and B's, overall only 28% were D's and F's. Some D's may even have counted for passing a course. Our high achieving students were concerned that they could be hurt and opted for the C/NC option, but the Provost is not sure we helped them. The Provost does not think we should opt for C/NC for students. What might make better sense is to look at our policies regarding retaking courses and changing policies regarding withdrawals.

We have been hearing a lot of concerns about RTP policies and inequities for faculty of color. We need to have larger conversations, maybe a taskforce on RTP.

C: We should allow a more liberal withdrawal policy. If a student is struggling they could withdraw from the class.

A: We could do something to modify the withdrawal policy, but it should come from a Senate committee.

C: It is a procedure and they can do retroactive withdrawals as well. We can start a conversation with Dean d'Alarcao and Vice Provost Anagnos. We can pull everyone with a 1.0 or lower GPA. Students have been taking advantage of the withdrawals. Withdrawals have doubled from last year.

C: I urge you to take a hard look at the withdrawal policy.

A: We need to consider the message we are sending and be cautious we are not saying you might not be able to do all the work we are giving them.

C: I would encourage a long term perspective on this. As more companies let people work from home, people will move. We need to disassociate the stresses of COVID-19 as we think of moving to C/NC.

A: We need to sit down and talk about the concerns with this policy.

C: I hesitate to launch another task force, when service demands are so great and you advocated for flexibility or slow-downs in service.

Q: When there is a change to the RTP process, it might be good to consider RSCA and allow for time to do the work we do. It might be helpful to have an analysis of how RSCA intersects with RTP? Also has there been a diversity or equity audit done with regard to RSCA assigned time?

A: There is no easy answer to this. There are efforts to make RTP more equitable. The Provost would hope RSCA could be more equitable.

C: There is always the issue of service. Frequently, committees don't value service as much as RSCA and teaching. Are we focusing on policy instead of implementation or interpretation of policy by evaluators?

A: If one did an assessment of the T/TT faculty you would be shocked to find that they did 8 hours of service each week.

Q: Can you find out the service hours for the T/TT faculty? Has there been an assessment from faculty regarding their service work? Also depends on how/what you define as service.

A: Deans are working on this. My question is how many committees do we really need? Are we overdoing this? Service shouldn't be 33% of the job you do unless your time is bought out to do that work.

C: Cultural taxation affects faculty inside and outside the university and RSCA as well.

C: If you can pull off reform to Scholarship and Engagement this year it will be a massive step forward. The three categories do not always count equally. The flexibility was intentional. Change comes generationally. Let's have a longer talk. Some people don't like giving RSCA as much weight as others including some senior leadership.

A: You have to give something up to get a larger portion.

C: This needs further discussion.

C: Maggie Barrera is on the PS Committee and may be able to support and provide perspectives.

9. From the CSU Statewide Senate:

An emergency meeting of the ASCSU was called. A substitute resolution for AB1460 was passed after a heated discussion. The ASCSU held an open, public meeting and this was also at the request of the Council of Ethnic Studies. ASCSU senators were asked to vote on the resolution in the public meeting.

Other topics discussed included faculty having their mode of teaching changed mid-semester and impact on teaching, peer observations, and evaluations. Loren Blanchard took notes and will speak to the Provosts. Nobody raised a complaint to the Provost.

10. The meeting adjourned at 1:34 p.m.

These minutes were taken and transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on November 16, 2020. The minutes were reviewed by Chair Mathur on November 20, 2020. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on November 23, 2020.

Executive Committee Minutes
November 23, 2020
via Zoom, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Present: Curry, Day, Del Casino, Delgadillo, Faas, Frazier, Marachi, Mathur, McKee, Peter, Sasikumar, Sullivan-Green, White, Faas, Wong(Lau)
Absent: Papazian
Guests: Edith Kinney, Garrick Percival, Gil Zamora, Thalia Anagnos, Anoop Kaur

1. From the Chair:
Senate Holiday Party is scheduled for 12/16/2020, 3:00pm-4:30pm. Chair is working with Zayna Tello and Amber Armstrong for this event. We have received substantive number of nominations for the four campus faculty awards and committee chairs been given the nominations and instructions. Many student nominations this year, but need more guidance on how to submit nominations.
2. The Executive Committee approved the consent agenda (Executive Committee Agenda of November 23, 2020, Executive Committee Minutes of November 16, 2020, and the Consent Calendar of November 23, 2020).
3. Taskforce on Community Safety and Policing
Guests: Patrick Day (co-chair) Edith Kinney (co-chair), Garrick Percival, and Gil Zamora
Part of this meeting is one of a multitude of engagement meetings with the campus and some off-campus (e.g., governance organizations). Opportunity to share thoughts, and concerns with safety and policing and interplay between these two. Scope is to look at dynamics of UPD and thinking of equity practices of UPD, but also thinking about safety and how people feel safe or not safe. Last meeting the taskforce focused on physical plant and safety, as well as UPD and making recommendations to keep all members of our community safe and treated appropriately. Some key foci included: communication (campus communication, infrastructure), different definitions of safety, relationship between San José Police department and our UPD, challenge of accessing information around policing, UPD staffing levels, UPD time use (as part of an urban university), impact of being part of urban environment, mental health and first responding, and what kind of new innovations can we bring to safety and policing. Good backgrounds of faculty involved with this taskforce.

Mandate is expansive, many issues are linked to broad definition of safety for faculty, students, and staff. Like to hear concerns from members of the executive committee, and how we can better realize safety to engage with different constituencies on campus. Important to think about different responsibilities that we ask of our police and how we organize resources to have less reliance on police. It speaks to deep issues of race and equality which has been a focus on our campus and in the country. Importance also of understanding the context and assisting the UPD to deal with situations as they arise. One main concern taskforce has discovered about policies and regulations is that it is opaque and not transparent to the community, especially in regards to mental health and policing. There are strong intersections with our city, programs and initiatives. Do you experience our campus as a safe space? If yes, why? If no, why not?

C: I don't experience it as particularly as safe, particularly at night. We have lot of non-university people coming through our hallways (at one side of the campus). Concerns with the bathroom, but also wandering through the hallway.

A: Many concerns have come up with bathrooms and homeless individuals. These are also community members who need resources, where is the city?

C: I would teach one night course a week, and there are students in the club rooms who would use paper to keep the doors open.

C: In our building we have an issue with the bathroom/locker room. Homeless people sleeping in there. Students are in club room and UPD is not checking these rooms.

A: Do they have authorization to be in there?

C. Students are staying in there. Students are sleeping in there.

A: What is UPD's job? What are policy issues and what are other things we should be doing?

C: Told students if caught after hours in the club room, no longer welcome there.

C: People have some good experiences with safety. But I have encountered unsafe experiences in the parking garages. I park by the stairs and only come in in the morning. Students who live on-campus have concern about walking across campus, and walking home after late hours library (pre-pandemic). Building community relationships is important to students. Demographic of students who don't feel safe with UPD. There is a conversation with students across campuses about changing UPDs. Is that a conversation happening here at SJSU? Any initiatives with these kinds of student concerns?

A: That is a lot to unpack. The taskforce has read articles on these issues and have surfaced these conversations (e.g., not having UPD). We will go to AS and talk with groups. We are the only downtown CSU.

A: We are looking at what would alternatives to public safety look like. How do we focus on public safety? Our location is important in how we best achieve these rules. If you have specific situations, please email those before we meet. Also noting DACA concerns with UPD.

A: If you have specific recommendations, please send via email.

C: Think about way students use in campus in reality. Students spend a lot of time between classes to collaborative work, and think about how spaces are available (e.g., homework, very late at night). Have a non-emergency number for UPD.

C: Do we have a non-emergency number? This is one of the issues of communications.

C: Reiterate issues with students. Club rooms and students are invited there, because they don't want to be alone. Have personally received poor assistance from UPD. In Clark Hall doors propped open, not always students, sometimes it is faculty and staff too. Clark, used for testing, testing guards harass our students, go into students' purses. Please think about the consequences about the loss of tutoring and overnight study space in the library. How can students have spaces to do group projects?

A: From whom are we feeling unsafe? Other students? Other groups?

C: It is both. Sometimes campus people, and sometimes it is not.

C: At Board of Trustees, demilitarization of UPD by students across the campuses. Many issues to surface. Please send additional information/concerns to Edith.

4. Discussion of Credit/No Credit and Withdrawals

Guests: Anoop Kaur, Thalia Anagnos

The senate and IS&A have received a referral about moving to Credit/No Credit (CR/NC) this semester.

Questions: Should we extend CR/NC for this academic year? Should this be an executive committee action or one that comes from IS&A? If we choose to not do CR/NC, is there a better alternative? How do we communicate best to the senate and with the campus?

Students: We believe that to expand on the creative and intellectual horizons of students and to fulfill the university mission of instruction, during this time of COVID-19, that it would be thoughtful to consider the extension of CR/NC to support student success. We believe that CR/NC creates flexibility and supports students during this pandemic. It is late in the semester, but we also need to recognize the conditions of this semester, wildfires, election, back in purple tier and disruption in courses and changes in syllabi across courses as a result. These conditions are different from last semester. There have been many students who have been reaching out. We appreciate flexibility with withdrawals and retroactive withdrawals, but also would appreciate support with CR/NC as well so that we can continue to put needs of students first.

C: Can you give an idea of how many students have reached out and are the clustered in certain colleges or majors, upper-division, lower-division?

A: The most common experience is with students who have other responsibilities. For example, student parents. Student demographics of what they can afford. Don't know exact number of across

those categories. It does come with communicating with students that we are not advisors, but noting their concerns to bring forward.

C: Concern with not disqualifying students this semester, we have spent a lot of time to catch students early to ensure that we get them on the road to success. We have a number of students who are doing worse this semester, but were not disqualified so we were not able to identify and provide support or gentle guidance.

C: Students are still adjusting to different impacts, personally don't think that we should punish them. Impacts have continued into this semester, financial pressures, family pressures. It is not that grades aren't a priority, they are. But it is difficult to prioritize with all of these continuing impacts, there are real-world issues that are affecting how they are doing in their classes.

C: How do you feel instead of CR/NC, being more liberal with withdrawal and retroactive withdrawal? NC is considered a repeat enrollee, with a W they can enroll as a first-time enrollee. Will that give students maximum flexibility?

C: Yes, that has been a road bump. For W that is harder for students, that is rock-bottom. CR/NC is still in the grey area. Both of those solutions are for different students, different populations. W is for students who have not been able to complete that work, whereas CR/NC is alleviating grade stress for students and giving option to complete work with grade that they are submitting.

C: From an academic affairs perspective, we have some data analysis for what happened last spring. Good to understand that process. CR/NC process is complex. Data will help answer on whether CR/NC is helping students.

C: Data that we found on our campus has been corroborated with CSU, LA with the same situation. We had 12059 undergraduate grade change requests, 6400 were unique students. 45% of those requests hurt (reduced) the students' GPA. They would have gotten an A or B, better than a credit. Another 15% would have had no impact on their GPA. 40% their GPA went up, but may have hurt themselves. For example, earned a D which is a NC, but they aren't making progress to degree. Earned a D in a prerequisite course, but now need to repeat the course. Only 23% had Fs or WUs who changed to CR/NC. 690 people changed back to grades, after they initially changed to CR/NC. This is one of the big concerns, Ds count toward the major. If not counting Ds, then it will prevent students from progressing.

C: Looking at other campuses only San Diego State has gone back to what they have done in the spring. Fullerton, if your course is CR/NC you can make a later decision. East Bay went to ABC/NC, and gave the option to go back. All of them gave a deadline of the end of the semester. Another key point is the system memo, they did not suspend EO1037 for this semester. Don't disagree that there are students who are earning B, who would like CR. There was probably stress reason, but there was not an uplift in student success.

C: CSU,LA chose not to go to CR/NC this fall, because it was creating inequities on their campus. Students who chose CR/NC, didn't get enough advising to understand the implications of CR/NC.

C: So, because EO1037 was not suspended, there could be consequences for students this semester that did not exist last semester.

C: Yes. Pomona for example, CR/NC maximum is determined by major and they have held to that. On our campus, we have a policy that says no major credits can be CR/NC. Depends on how we want to move the needle. The W option is a good option, extenuating circumstances applies. It doesn't hurt GPA, there is a value there. We can better advise students with this option.

C: Students are feeling pressure, we have two weeks left in the semester. Would giving students the option now actually help them in this last two weeks?

C: It would help some students, CR/NC would help them in their current situation. Also going back to the data where some went back to a letter grade. It shows that some students are better able to adapt than other students. Holding everyone to that standard, is unreasonable. CR/NC gives them the option, and this year has been very difficult.

C: This referral is for fall and spring?

C: Correct, perhaps as long as we remain virtual. Stanislaus State has extended until Summer 2021. We would like to do this as well.

C: Of all the ones that we can find, we only found SDSU and we have to be careful to note that it is

not helping students academically based on the data we collected on our campus.

C: Case for making CR/NC is that this semester is different. Last semester big switch in the middle of this semester, this semester we started out virtual. However, now we are hearing from students that things are changing in the middle, could you clarify what is happening? If faculty are changing things, do we have documentation of this? Can we track what those changes are?

C: This is more to do with the course schedules. Due to the wildfires, lower network capabilities of faculty, exams and assignments got postponed. Also, elements of participation not communicated through the syllabus (happening over Zoom), have to be on the camera, need to be present during presentations and make sure make a comment in the chat otherwise won't get the participation for the period (and that requirement is not on the syllabus).

C: Question about timeline for changes. What is possible if we wait until December 7th? We want flexibility for students, especially for Ws. But I am concerned that the executive committee not leap past the senate this time around.

C: We don't know where the president will fall on this, not convinced that going CR/NC will be the option that is preferred. Middle-ground would be W options. We would have to go after the semester and that would go into the winter break and would be very chaotic. Stanislaus State made the full option, but they may not be in compliance with the system.

C: What about withdrawal option? Sense of the Senate to allow W through final exams.

C: Yes, that can be done. Extend extenuating circumstances as far we can.

C: Concern is that students don't have enough information about use of withdrawals. Students are told that they will have to pay back financial aid if they ask for a W. This will require a lot of clear communication with students. Also, a concern is that for some students they will get it, for other students things are getting more chaotic by the day. To go back to the statistics, appreciate it. We have to understand, what did mean for those students to reverse their decision? Did they have access to advisors through the process? Did they get guidance from a mentor or advisor? Really concerned about the 45% who hurt themselves. Students may not know what the impact is of the decisions they are making. What are the interventions possible? We need to think about the students. We have students whose families who have come down with COVID and others who have become the main breadwinners. May be a small number, at the end of the day we need to listen to their situation. Give a sense of dignity to our students, have difficulty in reaching out. Those students who are reaching out need to say it is ok.

C: If we change to CR/NC, no way to effectively physically advise those students before the end of the semester. There are many other ways we can do to support students. It will be really hard to rush and do this, we don't students to hurt themselves long-term because they don't have the right advice. Even with the right advice, hard to get them to the right space.

C: Continued concern about the timeline, if should we thinking about further than spring 2021. Economic hardships are likely to be happening for 2-3 years. We need to think about longer term, change in CR/NC not just tying it to COVID, but need to have a more substantive plan of supports for students.

C: If we are going to CR/NC long-term, need to let all of the departments weigh in. We are talking about changing the curriculum, the way prerequisites are looked at in the curriculum. There are campuses where departments are saying we are not taking CR/NC, this will affect accreditation. We need to consult more strongly with departments if we make any decisions for long-term.

C: These are not normal times, can be disheartening for students, because we don't have anything for them.

C: Support the students in the request and encourage a lens of equity and the disparate impact on our underserved communities. The work requirements, family responsibilities, if we are changing CR/NC, there should be additional safety nets for students in place. Complex situation and we are in unprecedented times.

C: We need a fundamental restructuring in advising, and more attention to the frontline services we are providing to students. We need to have a bigger conversation on our campus, what do grades really do? The students who were most affected last spring, we are not reaching them effectively and we need to own that. And this goes into our equity gaps, we are not serving our students. CR/NC is

not addressing that, but there are other things that we can do so that we can assist our students in graduating. CR/NC does not solve things, and it may hinder our students who are thinking about graduate school. Need to be cautious.

C: We appreciate other measures, flexible withdrawals. But CR/NC addresses a population of students, where grades are not their priority. Not having a grade that truly reflects their academic work. Many competitive medical schools are accepting CR/NC, lesser schools not accepting CR/NC. We want to bring this forward in the most democratic way to the senate, we were hoping IS&A would bring this to the floor.

C: Do we think IS&A is the best place to bring forward a policy recommendation on CR/NC? Is there agreement in allowing students to do a retroactive withdrawal to replace WUs and Fs about to happen? Can we come up with a way, to wipe them out with a regular W?

C: That is a consideration, but concern when there is a dispute with a grade. Faculty need to change it, there is issue with grades being assigned by faculty, are we stepping on academic freedom?

C: No more than last spring. We need to consider economic repercussions for our students, and be flexible for WUs.

C: It is difficult for students to tell us that they are struggling financially. It is difficult for students to share their experiences right now. Certain students have to explain more because of economic dependence, it is about self-esteem about ability to access information. There are students who don't know where to begin, they have different kinds of knowledge.

C: What's happening to people is systemic all of these issues that people are facing. We need to look at systemic solutions, structure and policies that will one-off take care of things. My own family is privileged. There are people who are struggling, it seems to be what students are going through are differential financial impacts. But it is impacting different student populations differently. I don't think we are thinking of solutions that are addressing the right issues. We are concerned with students at the margins and those margins are significant. Doing nothing is not a good option. Those who are feeling ok this semester, may not be next semester. Expressing same frustration heard around this room, feeling bad that any student has to share their experience with the executive committee to bring that forward. Important that we consider this systemically. What we do has to have structure to it, not just solving the problem short-term, but long-term. As an example, we need good advising. We don't have the right services reaching the right students, we need to look at the bigger issue how we do things systemically as well. We are facing this situation for the next few years, we do need to do something.

C: Should we consider things like Ws from Fall 2020 will not be included in maximum limit for Ws, extend the W deadline to last day of classes or beyond (like January 2nd), advocating for extreme flexibility for retroactive Ws? To make sure that students are giving maximum flexibility with at least withdrawals. Concerns with withdrawals.

C: WUs don't want to be flexible, get rid of them. Change WUs or Fs to W. Problem there is no good guidance about WU for faculty.

C: There is policy around WUs, we would need to suspend that policy.

C: The bigger concern is do we want to do that? Would this be included in this one policy? Is that what we want to do in IS&A?

C: Under the current practices and policies, any student can petition for a W and we can push the deadline to the very end of the semester that they can withdraw. Anyone with a C, D, F, WU can petition for it. And we can make this petition very flexible.

C: They would have to be notified of financial aid implications. The chancellor's office memo also does not allow us to go over the W caps.

C: Two types of W, WA and WB. WA has 12 unit cap. WB is unlimited (extenuating circumstances). We could make it a January deadline when grades are posted. Flexibility there to allow for students to ensure GPAs are protected.

C: IS&A will work on these issues with this knowledge, hoping that working with Ws will provide some relief. Subgroup could work with Thalia, Marian, and Amy to ensure that policy or resolution language is correct.

C: What can we do if IS&A does not vote on CR/NC?

C: We can do Sense of the Senate resolution to focus on liberalizing Ws and other aspects of grading changes.

C: Are there ramifications for DQ if we change the policy? There may be significant problems for continued probation and disqualification suspension. Concerns taking it to the committee without suspension of EO 1037. Students making decisions without fully understanding the implications, FAQ last time it took a significant time to create.

C: Hard to get individual advising for students, it's really challenging right now. We don't know how to access the students who are struggling and how to do outreach with the students who need it.

C: IS&A will discuss these issues in committee. The chair can report back out to the Executive Committee. Subgroup of individuals will meet before the November 30th meeting to get more clarity over the details of implementation. Important to have students in the center of our decision-making, all trying to do our best at this time.

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

These minutes were taken and transcribed by the Senate Chair Ravisha Mathur on November 27, 2020. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on November 30, 2020.

**SJSU Academic Senate
December 7th, 2020 Consent Calendar**

ADD					
Committee Name	Name	Zip	Phone	Term	Seat (Title)
Graduate Studies and Research	Julia Gaudinski	0022	42431	EXO	Seat C – Director of Research Development
Accreditation Review Committee	Faranak Memarzadeh	0211	47487	2022	Seat O – Faculty-at-Large
Student Evaluation Review Board	Ganna Malik	0128	46244	2021	Seat K - Student
Student Success Committee	Coleetta McElroy	0011	46086	EXO	Seat A – Interim Senior AVP Enrollment Management
Student Success Committee	Amy Guerra-Smith	0011	46336	EXO	Seat D – Student Affairs Representative

Remove					
Committee Name	Name	Zip	Phone	Term	Seat (Title)
Academic Senate	Flor Rebeca Jimenez	0128	46244	2021	Senator – A.S. Director of Internal Affairs
Accreditation Review Committee	Ruma Chopra	0117	45515	2022	Seat O – Faculty-at-Large
Student Evaluation Review Board	Muhammad Aleem	0128	46244	2021	Seat K – Student
Student Fairness Committee	Meghana Gundluru	0128	46244	2021	Seat 4 – Student
Student Fairness Committee	Kyle Tran	0128	46244	2021	Seat 7 – Student
Student Success Committee	Sharon Willey	0011	47096	EXO	Seat A – Senior AVP Enrollment Management
Student Success Committee	Coleetta McElroy	0011	46086	EXO	Seat D – Student Affairs Representative
Student Success Committee	Sachi Tolani	0128	46244	2021	Seat G – Undergraduate / Graduate Student

9
10 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
11 **Adding Classes After Advance Registration**

12 **Rescinds:** S93-7

13
14 **Effective:** Immediately

15
16 **Whereas:** SJSU has historically used the waitlists only up to the end of Advance
17 Registration, and

18
19 **Whereas:** Faculty spend a significant amount of time managing student enrollment
20 after Advance Registration through the use of permission codes that
21 would be alleviated with an improved waitlist process, and

22
23 **Whereas:** Automated waitlists provide clarity and consistency in enrollment
24 procedures for students and faculty once the semester begins, and

25
26 **Whereas:** Improved waitlist processes will assist departments and colleges in
27 enrollment planning, and

28
29 **Whereas:** Graduating seniors have been granted priority for enrollment after
30 Advance Registration in earlier policies and that priority must be
31 maintained in an automated waitlist process, therefore be it

32
33 **Resolved:** That S93-7 be rescinded and the following be adopted.
34

35 **Rationale:** In Fall 2020, the university piloted using the waitlists after advance
36 registration. A manual process of accommodating graduating seniors who
37 were on waitlists was implemented. As a result of the positive outcomes
38 reported through a survey sent to department chairs, faculty, and advisors,
39 the university has taken steps to automate the prioritization of graduating
40 seniors. The process should be complete for Spring 2021 for graduating
41 seniors, but additional time will be necessary to incorporate graduating
42 graduate students in the process.

43 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
44 **Adding Classes After Advance Registration**
45

46 When demand for a course exceeds the enrollment cap for the course, students who
47 wish to enroll may place themselves on a waitlist. When a department elects to use
48 waitlists to automatically enroll courses, students who are on the waitlist will be
49 automatically enrolled up to the enrollment cap of the course should a space become
50 available.

51
52 Departments, in consultation with the Office of Undergraduate Education and/or the
53 College of Graduate Studies, may opt out of using waitlists for select courses both
54 during Advance Registration and after the term begins.

55
56 Waitlists will remain active for 9 days from the first day of instruction for the semester
57 and will continue to automatically enroll courses to their enrollment caps from the
58 waitlist. The waitlists will remain active for the Add Period for the Winter and Summer
59 sessions.

60
61 The students on waitlists will primarily be ordered based on the date a student signed
62 up for the waitlist, though the waitlists will be adjusted to give priority to graduating
63 seniors and graduating graduate students. Due to this adjustment, a student's position
64 on the waitlist may change over time.

65
66 Graduating seniors will be given priority to enroll in courses from the waitlists.
67 Graduating seniors are defined as those who have an approved graduation application
68 on file for the current term or the subsequent two terms, including the summer term.
69 Graduating seniors will be moved to the top of waitlists on an ongoing basis, both during
70 Advance Registration and after the term begins.

- 71 • Graduating seniors must have an approved graduation application on file for the
72 current or subsequent two terms, including summer term, in order to be moved to
73 the top of the waitlist.
- 74 • Graduating seniors must meet all necessary conditions for the waitlist.

75
76 Graduating graduate students will be given priority to enroll in courses from the waitlists.
77 Graduating graduate students are defined as those who have an approved candidacy
78 form on file for the current term or the subsequent two terms, including the summer
79 term. Graduating graduate students will be moved to the top of waitlists on an ongoing
80 basis, both during Advance Registration and after the term begins. Graduating graduate
81 students will be moved to the top of the waitlists for upper division and graduate level
82 courses with the same standing as graduating seniors.

- 83 • Graduating graduate students must have an approved candidacy form on file for
84 the current or subsequent two terms, including summer term, in order to be
85 moved to the top of the waitlist.
- 86 • Graduating graduate students must meet all necessary conditions for the waitlist.

87

88 When multiple graduating students are moved to the top of the list, they will be ordered
89 based on the time they signed up for the waitlist.

90
91 Waitlists will be used to automatically enroll a course up to the enrollment cap. Students
92 who are on the top of waitlist may not be enrolled if they are not able to satisfy all
93 necessary conditions. These conditions may include the following:

- 94 • Waitlisted students will not be enrolled if they are enrolled in another section of
95 the course.
- 96 • Waitlisted students will not be enrolled if they have a time conflict with another
97 course.
- 98 • Waitlisted students will not be enrolled if the additional units will cause the
99 student to exceed any maximum-unit limit that applies to the student, such as
100 first-semester freshman, first-semester-transfer students, or those on academic
101 probation, etc.

102

103

104

105 **Approved:** November 30, 2020

106

107 **Vote:** 14-0-0

108

109 **Present:** Chuang, French, Gomez Marcelino, Hill, Jackson (non-
110 voting), Khan, Lee, Leisenring (non-voting), Rao, Sen,
111 Sullivan-Green, Walker, Wilson, Wolcott, Yang, Yao

112

113 **Absent:** Delgadillo, Sorkhabi, Walters

114

115 **Financial impact:** Some resources will be needed to program the software to
116 manage the new process.

117

118 **Workload impact:** Workload is anticipated to be eased for faculty at the start of the
119 semester. There will be increased workload for IT to amend the
120 necessary PeopleSoft programs to implement the policy.

121

1 **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Organization and Government Committee**
4 **December 7, 2020**
5 **First Reading**

AS 1790

6
7 **Senate Management Resolution**
8 **Amendment of Senate Standing Rule 7a, Inclusion of Land**
9 **Acknowledgement in Academic Senate Agenda**
10

11
12 **Whereas:** Land acknowledgements are critical in recognizing past and current
13 injustice to Native Americans, and
14

15 **Whereas:** It is important that the Academic Senate, as a visible space of leadership
16 on this campus, incorporate this land acknowledgement in a public and
17 official way; and
18

19 **Whereas:** Adding this acknowledgement in the standing rules institutionalizes it in
20 Senate practice and philosophy beyond the current Senate Chair and any
21 future chair; therefore be it
22

23 **Resolved:** That we amend the Senate Standing Rule 7a to include 'Land
24 Acknowledgement' after the Call to Order, and Roll Call if taken,
25 and that we subsequently renumber the rest of the agenda outlined
26 in the rule.
27

28
29 **Approved:** November 16, 2020
30

31 **Vote:** 11-0-0
32

33 **Present:** Altura, de Bourbon, Grosvenor, Higgins, McClory, Millora, Okamoto,
34 Maciejewski, Sasikumar, Taylor, Thompson
35

36 **Absent:** None
37

38 **Financial Impact:** None anticipated.
39

40 **Workload Impact:** None anticipated.

6
7 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
8 **Accessibility in Curricular Materials**
9

10 **Rescinds:** S08-3
11
12

13 **Whereas:** Equitable education requires equal accessibility to all curricular materials;
14 and
15

16 **Whereas:** Ensuring accessibility should be the responsibility of all divisions at SJSU
17 and not limited to the Accessible Education Center, the Center for Faculty
18 Development, SJSU Information Technology, and Procurement; and

19 **Whereas:** Executive Order-11111 requires all CSU campuses to create and
20 implement plans to promote faculty and administrative practices that will
21 assure timely access to curricular materials for all students, and states
22 that “Each campus and the Chancellor's Office shall provide funding,
23 resources, and training to members of its campus community to ensure
24 compliance with this executive order. CSU campuses and the Chancellor's
25 Office may consult with Systemwide Professional Development in the
26 Human Resources Division of the Chancellor's Office for assistance in
27 locating available resources and tools that will meet campus-specific
28 needs;” and

29 **Whereas:** Incorporation of accessibility is an ongoing process that requires faculty
30 and staff time, resources, and training, and faculty need support in
31 adapting course materials to meet accessibility standards; therefore be it

32 **Resolved:** That S08-3 be rescinded effective immediately and the new policy
33 described herein be approved; and be it further

34 **Resolved:** That faculty shall select or create accessible versions of all curricular
35 materials (including but not limited to course textbooks, syllabus,
36 handouts, electronic materials, learning management system, etc.), which
37 shall be made available to all students simultaneously; and be it further

38 **Resolved:** That if materials cannot be made accessible due to technology limitations
39 then an equally effective alternative must be created or provided; and be it
40 further

41 **Resolved:** That faculty shall be informed regularly of available resources to train
42 them in developing accessible course materials or equally effective
43 alternatives, which are offered through campus units such as the Center
44 for Faculty Development, the Accessible Education Center, Affordable
45 Learning Solutions, and eCampus; and be it further

46 **Resolved:** That all faculty and staff shall undergo accessibility training appropriate to
47 their duties; and be it further

48 **Resolved:** That the appropriate Vice President(s) shall conduct a baseline
49 assessment to determine compliance with federally mandated accessibility
50 requirements for courses and designate the appropriate resources to bring
51 the campus into full compliance; and be it further

52 **Resolved:** That a report be submitted by each department, as part of the normal
53 program planning process, assessing the extent to which its existing
54 courses meet federally mandated accessibility criteria and faculty and staff
55 have received appropriate training.

56 **Rationale:** Each CSU campus is required to develop "a method to incorporate
57 accessibility as a required component in the curriculum review and
58 approval process." University Policy S08-3 established timelines that have
59 since expired and the policy needed to be updated significantly with
60 additional details on accessibility. The print-based and electronic curricular
61 materials covered in this policy must be accessible or equally effective
62 alternatives to all students simultaneously. The development and/or
63 conversion of curricular materials to accessible format is an important
64 aspect of the SJSU mission to provide quality education for all students.
65 Curriculum and Research has worked the last two years on this policy and
66 obtaining information from various parties across campus on how to
67 update the policy appropriately. An inherent problem in ensuring
68 accessibility is the cost associated with accessibility and C&R was unable
69 to put an accurate estimate on this cost.

70
71 **Approved:** 11/30/2020

72 **Vote:** 11-0-0

73 **Present:** Anagnos, Backer, d'Alarcao, Dudley, Hart, Kaur, Kitajima, Khavul, Maffini,
74 Masegian, White (chair)
75 **Absent:** Stacks
76 **Guests:** Schraeder (recording)
77

78 Relevant documents are available online:

79 EO-1111: calstate.policystat.com/policy/6590867/latest

80 SJSU University Policy F07-3 (www.sjsu.edu/senate/docs/F07-3.pdf) outlines
81 procedures for the timely adoption of textbooks, course readers and library reserves.

82 **Financial Impact:** The magnitude of the financial impact will depend upon the needs
83 assessment, but we expect that it will be substantial.

84 **Workload Impact:** We anticipate increases in workload for:

- 85 ● departments that are undergoing program planning to review
86 accessibility of all department curriculum
- 87 ● faculty involved in creating new accessible course materials or
88 finding equally effective alternatives
- 89 ● campus staff to work with faculty to create accessible materials
- 90 ● university to conduct a needs-based assessment to determine the
91 actual cost of implementing accessibility campus-wide.

92

8 **Sense of the Senate**
9 **On Continued Maximum Flexibility and Support of SJSU Students**
10 **During the Prolonged COVID-19 Pandemic**
11

12 **Whereas:** The COVID-19 pandemic continues its unprecedented disruption of
13 university operations; and
14

15 **Whereas:** The SJSU campus and its community were also heavily impacted by
16 unprecedented wildfire activity across the Bay Area in the first weeks of
17 the Fall 2020 semester that resulted in evacuations for faculty, students,
18 and staff, canceled classes, and campus closure; and
19

20 **Whereas:** The SJSU Academic Senate has repeatedly advocated for maximum
21 flexibility and understanding on the part of faculty while working with
22 students; and
23

24 **Whereas:** Student senators are advocating for student voices to be heard regarding
25 decisions related to grading and student success during virtual learning;
26 and
27

28 **Whereas:** Students continue to need accommodation for a variety of hardships
29 including, but not limited to, stress, anxiety, depression, other mental
30 health issues, unexpected disruptions in work schedules, financial
31 difficulties, shifts in housing and study environments, an increase of family
32 responsibilities, and the ability to access adequate or regular computer
33 equipment or internet service; and
34

35 **Whereas:** Students should continue to be afforded the opportunity to request
36 assistance in reducing the potential negative impact that the COVID-19
37 pandemic and other emergency incidents may have on their academic
38 record; and
39

40 **Whereas:** An overly rapid change to the grading policy without adequate time to
41 properly advise students regarding choosing Credit/No Credit could result
42 in a negative outcome, especially in light of data from Spring 2020 that
43 shows choosing Credit/No Credit had a negative impact for many students
44 despite having time to consult with advisors and faculty and may create
45 educational inequities in progress towards degree; therefore be it
46

47 **Resolved:** That the SJSU Academic Senate ask the university to continue to support
48 students who experience great hardships that affect their academic
49 performance by educating faculty and encouraging them to consider the
50

- assignment of an Incomplete (I) for students who were able to
- assignment of an Unauthorized Withdrawal (WU) grade instead of

51 complete most but not all of the coursework
52

- assignment of an Unauthorized Withdrawal (WU) grade instead of

53 assigning a failing grade (F) for students who are unable to
54 complete most of the coursework; and therefore be it
55

56 **Resolved:** That the SJSU Academic Senate ask the university to reach out to and
57 advise students who have been unsuccessful in their coursework,
58 especially those who have received grades of Unauthorized Withdrawal
59 (WU) due to these unprecedented circumstances, to consider formally
60 requesting a Withdrawal (W) from some or all of their courses (and to
61 make this request an easy, clearly communicated process to students);
62 and therefore be it
63

64 **Resolved:** That the SJSU Academic Senate ask the university to review all
65 Withdrawal (W) applications so that students are given fair consideration
66 for circumstances which may be difficult to provide thorough
67 documentation for, and to have the Director of the Academic Advising and
68 Retention Services review all denials and appeals to ensure consistency
69 in approving applications and in granting exceptions; and therefore be it
70

71 **Resolved:** That the SJSU Academic Senate ask the university to include a notation
72 on all students' transcripts highlighting the potential impact of the
73 pandemic on their grades for Fall 2020; and therefore be it
74

75 **Resolved:** That the SJSU Academic Senate ask the university to continue to consider
76 means of supporting students to address the underlying issues that lead to
77 poor student success through outreach from CAPS or SJSU Cares,
78 informing and training faculty on various resources available to support
79 students, and outreach through Advancement to raise funds to support
80 students' non-academic needs.
81

82 **Approved:** December 7, 2020

83 **Vote:** 14-0-0

84 **Present:** Chuang, French, Gomez Marcelino, Hill, Jackson (non-
85 voting), Khan, Lee, Leisenring (non-voting), Rao, Sen,
86 Sullivan-Green, Walker, Wilson, Wolcott, Yang, Yao

87 **Absent:** Delgadillo, Sorkhabi, Walters

88 **Financial impact:** Some resources may be needed to provide additional
89 support for support staff, advisors and faculty.

90 **Workload impact:** There would be additional workload from support staff and advisors
91 to serve students and train faculty.
92

1 **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Instruction and Student Affairs Committee**
4 **December 7, 2020**
5 **Final Reading**
6
7
8

AS 1793

9
10 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
11 **Amendment C to University Policy S16-16**
12 **Probation and Disqualification, Temporary Amendment due to the**
13 **COVID-19 Pandemic**

14 **Amends:** University Policy S16-16 for the 2020-2021 Academic Year

15
16 **Effective:** Immediately through the 2020-2021 Academic Year

17 **Whereas:** The COVID-19 pandemic continues its unprecedented disruption of
18 university operations and student success; and

19 **Whereas:** This disruption will continue through the 2020-2021 Academic Year; and

20 **Whereas:** The University continues to take steps to support students through policy
21 modifications and procedural changes; and

22 **Whereas:** Data shows that there are equity gaps that indicates students of color are
23 disproportionately affected by the current circumstances and who would
24 be disqualified without intervention; therefore be it

25 **Resolved:** That University Policy S16-16, Probation and Disqualification, Sections I.B
26 and II.B shall be suspended for the 2020-2021 Academic Year. This
27 suspension applies for academic probation only. No other forms of
28 probation are affected by this suspension. Students who are currently on
29 academic probation will be allowed to continue on probation through
30 Spring 2021.

31
32 **Approved:** November 30, 2020

33 **Vote:** 14-0-0

34 **Present:** Chuang, French, Gomez Marcelino, Hill, Jackson (non-voting),
35 Khan, Lee, Leisenring (non-voting), Rao, Sen, Sullivan-Green,
36 Walker, Wilson, Wolcott, Yang, Yao

37 **Absent:** Delgadillo, Sorkhabi, Walters

38 **Financial impact:** None expected.

39 **Workload impact:** It is anticipated that there will be an increase in workload for the
40 Registrar's Office and advisors to implement this process for the
41 2020-2021 academic year.

1 **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Professional Standards Committee**
4 **December 7, 2020**
5 **Final Reading**

AS 1794

6
7
8 **POLICY**
9 **RECOMMENDATION**
10 **Amendment D to University Policy S15-8,**
11 **Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty**
12 **Employees:**
13 **Criteria and Standards**
14 **Deleting an obsolete reference**

15
16
17 **Resolved:** That S15-8 be amended as shown in the strikeout of the excerpted policy.

18
19 **Rationale:** The College of Extended and International Studies was excluded from
20 coverage under this policy when the policy was adopted in 2015 since at
21 the time that college did not contain faculty. Since then, the college has
22 been renamed and faculty have been assigned to the new academic unit,
23 making this exclusionary language obsolete and unnecessary.

24
25 **Approved:** November 16, 2020

26 **Vote:** (11-0-0)

27 **Present:** Peter, Wang, Raman, Smith, Cargill, Saldamli, Riley, Quok,
28 Mahendra, Barrera, Monday

29 **Absent:** None

30
31 **Financial Impact:** No direct impact

32
33 **Workload Impact:** No direct impact

36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

POLICY
RECOMMENDATION
Amendment D to University Policy S15-8
Appointment of Regular Faculty Employees
Deleting an obsolete reference

1.5.2 When this document refers to colleges it means those academic units that are home to Unit 3 tenure/tenure track faculty. ~~This excludes the College of International and Extended Studies~~

1 **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Professional Standards Committee**
4 **December 7, 2020**
5 **First Reading**

AS 1795

6
7
8 **POLICY**
9 **RECOMMENDATION**
10 **Amendment J to University Policy S15-7**
11 **RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION FOR REGULAR**
12 **FACULTY EMPLOYEES: PROCEDURES**
13 **RTP Procedures for Joint Appointments**
14

15
16 **Resolved:** That S15-7 be amended as shown in the underlined addition to the
17 excerpted policy.

18
19 **Rationale:** The Collective Bargaining Agreement provides for joint RTP committees
20 for “joint appointments,” and since SJSU has recently added a number of
21 faculty with duties in more than one department/college, policy needs to
22 provide for joint committees for joint appointments. Otherwise the CBA
23 requires that a candidate be evaluated by TWO department committees.
24 This amendment creates a simple mechanism for creating joint
25 department committees to evaluate joint appointments—as provided for in
26 the CBA.
27

28
29 **Approved:** November 23, 2020

30 **Vote:** (10-0-0)

31 **Present:** Peter, Wang, Raman, Smith, Cargill, Riley, Quok, Mahendra,
32 Barrera, Monday

33 **Absent:** Saldamli

34 **Financial Impact:** No direct impact

35 **Workload Impact:** No direct impact
36
37
38
39

40 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
41 **Amendment J to University Policy S15-7**
42 **RETENTION, TENURE AND PROMOTION FOR REGULAR FACULTY EMPLOYEES:**
43 **PROCEDURES**
44 **RTP Procedures for Joint Appointments**
45

46
47 3.0 Procedures for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

48
49 3.7 Modified Procedures for Joint Appointments
50

51 3.7.1 Candidates who hold joint appointments, as indicated in their
52 appointment letters (S15-6, 5.6) shall be evaluated at the
53 department level by a committee with representation from each
54 relevant department, and this representation shall be roughly
55 proportionate to the assignment of the candidate. The committee
56 shall be chaired by a committee member from the home
57 department as identified in the appointment letter.
58

59 3.7.2 Members on joint committees shall be elected as per all normal
60 procedures of policy, save only that a current department
61 committee may simply designate some of its already elected
62 members for simultaneous service on the joint committee.
63

64 3.7.3 The chair of the home department shall hold the normal functions of
65 chair for the evaluation of a joint appointment; the chairs of other
66 departments in which the appointment is made are eligible to serve
67 on the joint department-level committee.
68

69 3.7.4 Candidates who hold joint appointments across more than one
70 college shall be evaluated by the college committee and the college
71 dean corresponding to their home department.

1 **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Professional Standards Committee**
4 **December 7, 2020**
5 **Final Reading**

AS 1796

6
7
8 **POLICY**
9 **RECOMMENDATION**
10 **Amendment C to University Policy S15-6**
11 **Appointment of Regular Faculty Employees**
12 **Deleting an obsolete reference**

13
14
15 **Resolved:** That S15-6 be amended as shown in the strikeout of the excerpted policy.

16
17 **Rationale:** The College of Extended and International Studies was excluded from
18 coverage under this policy when the policy was adopted in 2015 since at
19 the time that college did not contain faculty. Since then, the college has
20 been renamed and faculty have been assigned to the new academic unit,
21 making this exclusionary language obsolete and unnecessary.

22
23 **Approved:** November 16, 2020

24 **Vote:** (11-0-0)

25 **Present:** Peter, Wang, Raman, Smith, Cargill, Saldamli, Riley, Quok,
26 Mahendra, Barrera, Monday

27 **Absent:** None

28 **Financial Impact:** No direct impact

29 **Workload Impact:** No direct impact

30

31

32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

POLICY RECOMMENDATION
Amendment C to University Policy S15-6
Appointment of Regular Faculty Employees
Deleting an obsolete reference

1.2 When this document refers to colleges it means those academic units that are home to Unit 3 tenure/tenure track faculty. ~~This excludes the College of International and Extended Studies~~

1 **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Professional Standards Committee**
4 **December 7, 2020**
5 **First Reading**
6

AS 1797

7
8 **POLICY**
9 **RECOMMENDATION**
10 **Amendment D to University Policy S15-6**
11 **Appointment of Regular Faculty Employees**
12 **Defining Joint Appointments in Appointment Letters**
13

14 **Resolved:** That S15-6 be amended as shown in the underlined addition to the
15 excerpted policy.
16

17 **Rationale:** The Collective Bargaining Agreement provides for joint RTP committees
18 for “joint appointments,” and since SJSU has recently added a number of
19 faculty with duties in more than one department/college, policy now needs
20 to provide for joint committees for joint appointments. Otherwise the CBA
21 requires that a candidate be evaluated by TWO separate department
22 committees. This amendment defines joint appointments, so that a
23 related amendment to the procedures policy can establish a simple
24 mechanism for creating joint department committees.
25

26 **Approved:** November 23, 2020

27 **Vote:** (10-0-0)

28 **Present:** Peter, Wang, Raman, Smith, Cargill, Riley, Quok, Mahendra,
29 Barrera, Monday

30 **Absent:** Saldamli

31 **Financial Impact:** No direct impact

32 **Workload Impact:** No direct impact
33
34

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

**POLICY
RECOMMENDATION
Amendment D to University Policy S15-6
Appointment of Regular Faculty Employees
Defining Joint Appointments in Appointment Letters**

....

5.0 Appointment letters

....

5.6 A joint appointment occurs when an appointment letter specifies that a faculty member will have duties in more than one department or equivalent unit. The letter shall determine the parameters of the assignment shared between the relevant departments as per the CBA (12.1), and the letter should indicate which department will be the home department.

1 **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Curriculum and Research Committee**
4 **December 7, 2020**
5 **Final Reading**

AS 1798

6 **POLICY**
7 **RECOMMENDATION**
8 **Amendment C to University Policy S14-5,**
9 **Guidelines for General Education (GE),**
10 **American Institutions (AI), and the Graduation Writing**
11 **Assessment**
12 **Requirement (GWAR)**

13 **Whereas:** CSU Executive Order 1100 states “Each CSU campus shall define GE student-
14 learning outcomes within a programmatic structure”; and

15 **Whereas:** The Academic Senate endorses the long-standing principle that curricular
16 standards are the responsibility of faculty as noted in the Sense of the Senate
17 Resolution SS-F17-2; and

18 **Whereas:** On August 17, 2020 Governor Newsom signed into law Education Code Section
19 89032 mandating that the California State University require completion of a 3-
20 unit course in ethnic studies as part of all undergraduate degrees, for students
21 graduating in the 2024–25 academic year and beyond; and

22
23 **Whereas:** The law indicates that the learning outcomes for this ethnic studies course shall
24 be developed through a consultative process of the Academic Senate of
25 California State University, Chancellor’s Office, and the CSU Ethnic Studies
26 Council; and

27
28 **Whereas:** On September 10, 2020 a memo from Executive Vice Chancellor Loren J.
29 Blanchard indicates that “Campus Academic Senates finalize revisions to their
30 campus GE programs based on the revised EO on CSU GE Breadth” and
31 provided a specific timeline; and

32
33 **Whereas:** The CSU Board of Trustees has aligned Title 5 with the language required by the
34 legislation; therefore be it

35 **Resolved:** That the SJSU GE Guidelines be updated to create a 3-unit Area F, Ethnic
36 Studies requirement effective Academic Year 2021/22 to be in alignment with
37 Title 5; and be it further

38 **Resolved:** That the GE Area D lower division requirements shall be reduced from 9 units to
39 6 units in accordance with the recent changes in Title 5; and be it further

40 **Resolved:** That the Curriculum and Research Committee will bring to the Academic Senate
41 the complete and updated GE Guidelines for approval no later than May 10,
42 2021.

43 **Rationale:** This modification to SJSU GE Guidelines puts San José State University in
44 compliance with the memo from the Chancellor's Office and changes within Title 5. It will also
45 give the Curriculum and Research Committee the time needed to engage in a consultative
46 process, as is the tradition of the Academic Senate, to appropriately update the GE Guidelines
47 with the necessary details in order to fully execute these changes for Academic Year 2021/22.

48 **Timeline and Implementation:** First Time Freshman entering SJSU AY 2021/22 will be subject
49 to the updates to Area D and new Area F. Current SJSU students and continuously enrolled
50 California Community College transfer students will be held to the GE Guidelines aligned with
51 their catalog rights.

52 **Approved:** 11/30/2020

53 **Vote:** 11-0-0

54 **Present:** Anagnos, Backer, d'Alarcao, Dudley, Hart, Kaur, Kitajima, Khavul, Maffini,
55 Masegian, White (chair)

56 **Absent:** Stacks

57 **Guests:** Schraeder (recording)

58 **Workload impact:** There will be a temporary increase in workload for: (1) the Curriculum and
59 Research Committee to update the GE guidelines, (2) the General
60 Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) and General Education Review
61 Panel to review, evaluate, and approve initial courses in GE AREA F for
62 AY 2021/22, (3) staff to make changes to the online catalog, degree
63 roadmaps, various websites, publications and PeopleSoft, (4) articulation
64 staff to work with community colleges, (5) department and college
65 curriculum committees to make changes to all degree programs, and (6)
66 advising and orientation personnel. The SJSU Catalog must contain the
67 updates to Area D and at least one course in the new Area F in order to
68 meet all catalog requirements and student rights. In order to accomplish
69 this at least one course for the new Area F must be reviewed and
70 approved by GEAC.

71 **Faculty impact:** The creation of a new GE Area may require the hiring of additional faculty
72 with expertise in ethnic studies (i.e., "Ethnic studies are an
73 interdisciplinary and comparative study of race and ethnicity with special
74 focus on four historically defined racialized core groups: Native
75 Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Latina and Latino
76 Americans" - Education Code Section 89032 for AB 1460). In AY 2019/20

77 SJSU enrolled 3,964 first time freshmen, so the number of sections
78 needed is substantial.

79 Per Title 5, the lower division Area D requirement will be reduced from 9
80 to 6 units, and as such, there will be a significant impact on faculty and
81 FTES in that area. There is the potential for lecturers to lose their jobs as
82 a result. There may be a temporary increase in advising workload for
83 departments due to catalog rights of students who will continue to need 9
84 units to fulfill Area D requirements.

85 **Financial impact:** It is unclear as to the total financial impact of this policy: potential
86 recruitment of additional faculty to teach within the new GE Area and a
87 reduction of faculty FTE teaching courses within Area D.

88 C&R feels that these impacts as outlined are underestimated without
89 additional information.