

**SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE
2020/2021**

Agenda

April 19, 2021, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm

via Zoom: <https://sjsu.zoom.us/j/81156658754>

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:

X. State of the University Announcements:

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

XI. Adjournment

2021-2022 Academic Senate Minutes
March 22, 2021

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

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

- II. Land Acknowledgement: The land acknowledgement is a formal statement that recop167 Td [/n1g6 (oz)-167(e)-27 (a)0.16.6 (l)-0.77 Td [/n12 72 261.2 Tm ()Tj l16.6 (nt)-11.4.6 and powerful way of showing respect and a step towards correcting the stories and practices that have erased our Indigenous people's history and culture and it is a step towards inviting and honoring the truth. Senator Kaur read the Land Acknowledgement.
- III. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–
The minutes of March 1, 2021 were approved (45-0-1).

C: While this is fantastic news, I'd love to hear where we go from here with regard to supporting our Native American Students? Will we have a center like the APID/A Center?

A: [President] We have a group working on the issues with our Native American Students. They haven't come forward with recommendations yet. CDO Wong where are we with this?

A: [CDO] From what we are hearing, I think they would like a Native American Student Center.

A: [President] I'll take this back to the team and see if I can drilldown a little bit more information on this.

V. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

EC Minutes of February 15, 2021 – No questions

EC Minutes of February 22, 2021 – No questions

EC Minutes of March 15, 2021 – No questions

B. Consent Calendar:

There was no dissent to the Consent Calendar of March 22, 2021 as amended by AVC Marachi to add Dina Izenstark to the C&R Committee.

AVC Marachi announced the results of the Senate Elections for 2021-2022. She welcomed the new senators.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

VI. Unfinished Business:

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

A. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

Senator Peter presented AS 1805, Policy Recommendation, Amendment

E to University Policy S15-8, Red AAVbrary-5.7 (C)-0.7 (3mmC /P <</t)5.6 (t)5TJ 0 Tc e21

Q: Overall I like this policy very much. I like it gives lecturers the respect they deserve. I would like to speak to 4.2.3.1.5., unsolicited materials. This is vePDIIg[

identified in other racial and ethnic categories.” The Senate voted and AS 1809 passed as a mended (46-0 -0).

Q: I had a question about compensation, whether assigned time or stipend can be provided. Have you had has the committee had a conversation with administration regarding this?

A: This is sense of the senate, so we are assuming that the president will consider this.

Q: Would it be possible to consider speeding up the timeline considering how critical these issues are and whether or not it would be possible to establish earlier timeline perhaps fall of 21 rather than spring of 22?

A: We did consider timeline, but we considered with assigned time it would be too disruptive for fall 21.

C: This is an administrative decision, and we hope to have a successful search in American Indian Studies.

Q: Did you consider pulling that gigantic data problem with Native American student identity being aggregated?

C: Yes we had quite a bit of discussion there, we need to look at the data more carefully and ensure that we aggregate appropriately.

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

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

Senator White presented AS 1807, Policy Recommendation, Adoption of Guidelines for General Education (GE) American Institutions (AI), and the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) (First Reading).

C&R has still not finished going through all the feedback they have received.

There are over 45 pages. However, C&R wanted to get Senate feedback on the GE Guidelines they have started working on. Most of their time have been spent on upper division GE, areas R, S, and V.

Questions:

Q: My question is how aware is C&R of the nature of the consultation process that the American Institutions Advisory Panel conducted. I mention this because today I talked to a member of that advisory panel that said they were given their charge on the 1st of February and had to finish by the middle of February. These are the most radical changes to the American Institutions requirements I've seen in 31 years at SJSU. I did not know my department had a representative on this group and I'm sure the rest of my department did not know as well until the work was done? Has American Institutions really been thoroughly vetted?

A: I cannot truly answer that question. They should have had at least 6 weeks. The GRPs are under GEAC, but I can reach out and ask what their consultation was.

Q: I would like to join Senator Peter and Senator Wong(Lau) with their concerns with the document forwarded from Communication Studies. I would like to know what the abstentions were about in committee on this resolution?
It also

us to vote up and down on, and then bring the rest in a future year. However, that is up to C&R.

Q: You mentioned that we have an exceptionally high number of visitors at this meeting and I believe they are here because they have serious issues with the GE guidelines and we need to have more consultation. The second thing I want to do is urge the Senate to look at the document circulated by Communications Studies. I also want to respond specifically to Senator Okamoto. I teach a course in Area V that would no longer be possible under the revised guidelines specifically because of the creative works of expression. If you look at the last page of the document circulated from Communication Studies, it refers not just to creative works, but also to texts and structures. This would broaden the outline to allow scientific work to be presented in Area V. I also believe we should listen to our colleagues. My colleague who teaches in Area F states that changes to outcomes 3 and 4 in Area F shift the course from the study of inequality organized around a theme to a class about values and dialogue. Grading an assignment based on one's values is difficult, because it is subjective. Also, the word dialogue means different things to different people. This also changes the focus of Area F from self and society to just self. Also, U.S. 2 is now lacking emphasis on civic engagement, demographic changes in California and an emphasis on civil liberties, voting, and civil rights.

A: We will definitely take this back to the committee.

Q: I have two concerns. One has to do with instructor qualifications. I do not believe we should have the doctorate as a preferred requirement because it sends a message that if you don't have a doctorate you are less preferred and many of our lower division classes are taught by those with Master's degrees. I also have some language changes on line 458. This puts the students into two categories. One category for English language learners and another for multi-language 2.95 -4 9.133 0 Td (-16.6 (gor)-2i)-0.7 (rput)-1116.7 (t)-11.3 (b (no

A: [Frazier] I sit on the University Writing Committee. We did discuss this, but something must have happened in the transition to C&R. This does not accurately reflect what we discussed. However, we didn't have a lot of time.

A: Part of the reason it is not identical is that C&R did make changes.

Q: I would like to raise some questions about Area S. I teach Area S and V classes. Some of the changes in learning objectives for Area S seem to be power evasive, admiring the problem instead of fostering critical thinking, and to have a lack of criticality. I wonder if that was intentional. As an example, learning objective three has gone from, "describe social actions which have led to greater equality and social justice in the U.S." to "describe social actions that have led to something." We are replacing that with a discussion of our own values. That seems very power evasive and very much like admiring the problem and re-centering more of an individualism perspective. In learning objective 4, we replace, "recognizing and appreciating constructive interactions" with "talking about difference." This is again admiring the problem. In learning objective 2, we replace language describing historical, social, political, and economic processes producing diversity, equality and structured inequalities in the U.S." and in a time of Black Lives Matter we are going to change that to "diversity, equity, and inclusion." This is a great name

(b) (5) - (A), (b) (5) - (C), (b) (5) - (D), (b) (5) - (E), (b) (5) - (F), (b) (5) - (G), (b) (5) - (H), (b) (5) - (I), (b) (5) - (J), (b) (5) - (K), (b) (5) - (L), (b) (5) - (M), (b) (5) - (N), (b) (5) - (O), (b) (5) - (P), (b) (5) - (Q), (b) (5) - (R), (b) (5) - (S), (b) (5) - (T), (b) (5) - (U), (b) (5) - (V), (b) (5) - (W), (b) (5) - (X), (b) (5) - (Y), (b) (5) - (Z)

C: R, S, and V reflect the upper division versions of B, C, and D. I am heartened by the conversation we are having. I do think the whole thing should come back again for a second reading with maybe a time limited discussion on each section and then return for a final reading later. I think we are getting on the right track. I also agree with Senator Wong(Lau) that we need to know why we are doing these changes and not only who it affects, but who is left out.

C: Area F is subject to law and has to be put in place before the end of the semester. The question about whether this is brought back section by section is something we need to take seriously. We will be out of compliance in the fall if we don't have Area F in place and at least one course in it. I think these conversations are great. It does suggest maybe 9 PLOs are too many.

C: As I was listening to the comment about self-reflection being one of the reasons for the changes to Area S, I was thinking self-reflection has to happen in the context of larger unequal structures.

A: I'll bring that back to the committee.

Q: I would like to formally move to refer this back to committee.

A: This is a first reading so it will go back to committee.

Q: I'm concerned that it will come back for a second reading and not be ready. I think the idea of bringing it back in pieces is the way to go here.

Q: I was at the GE summit and remember the discussions about Area R, and Area R is reflective of Area B, and in our discussions there was a lot of talk about having Area R be broader and that seemed to be reflected in the first draft of the guidelines. Can you tell me why this was not applied in Area R in this draft?

A: They were initially applied to Area R and then the committee received additional feedback and it was changed.

Q: Can I ask you to bring it back to the committee and ask them to make it broad again?

A: Yes, I will bring it back to the committee.

C: The fact is that Area B does not require that it be broad

Registration (Final Reading). Senator Sullivan-Green presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change, “graduating seniors” to “graduate students” in lines 32, 33, 35, 38 and 43 and in line 41 change, “graduating seniors” to “graduating students.” The Senate voted and AS 1808 passed as amended (42-0 -2).

Q: Reason for two abstentions in the committee?

A: Some committee members who are not well versed in registration who are electing to abstain.

VIII. State of the University Announcements:

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

IX. Special Committee Reports:

Time Certain: 3:30 p.m., Campus Master Plan Report:

Traci Ferdolage, Senior AVP for Facilities Development and Operations, Jane Lin, Architect and Linda Dalton, Professor Emeritus Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, Dalton Education & Associates presented a report on the Campus Master Plan.

Traci Ferdolage: We have only just begun this process. Campus Master Planning is a multi-year process. Our master plan is designed to build upon Transformation 2030 and serve as a long range planning guide for accommodating projected student enrollment and its related educational research, student support programs as well as various administrative services necessary for the successful operation of the campus. In short, the plan is designed to envision the future physical development of the campus. During the fall semester, our team conducted over 80 hours of interviews with leadership from more than 20 campus stakeholder groups to see what they thought should be addressed in the plan. Stakeholder groups represented

s aludek-11.36 (de)Tip To 06 T rowl 0.6 (M) 2 (7) 4 (nat) 0.63 (de) 6 (4) 0.71 (gr) 6.8 (t) 6 (Ed) 13.0 (s) 60 (s) 12

addition, interviewees offer many suggestions such as making ground floor activity much more visible.

A:

Executive Committee Minutes
March 15, 2021
via Zoom, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

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

1. From the Chair:

Chair Mathur commented on the planning for Honors Convocation and that there were approximately 2,700 President's and 7,900 Dean's Scholars. This event will be on April 23rd.

Chair Mathur reminded everyone to save the date for the live virtual Faculty Service Recognition Awards Event on April 15, 12:30-1:30pm. There are approximately 135 faculty honorees and two faculty with 40 years of service.

2. The Consent Agenda was approved (Executive Committee Agenda of March 15, 2021, Consent Calendar of March 15, 2021 as amended to include Sabrina Pinnell on the IRB, Executive Committee minutes of March 8, 2021 (14-0-0).

3. Consent Calendar Discussion and Referral:

The Executive Committee discussed the seat for the AS President on the Accreditation Review Committee (ARC). The website shows the seat as being for the AS President. The AS President cannot serve on the committee due to a class schedule conflict. A member noted that the policy establishing the ARC does show "or designee," but the website does not. The Senate Administrator noted that many changes occurred as a result of the global changes to the bylaws by O&G last year. However, the Senate Administrator will research this and report back to the committee. [Note: The Senate Administrator researched this and it was an error on her part and the website has been corrected.]

The committee discussed the fact that the AS President from a few years ago requested specific AS Board members be assigned to committees. Previously the policy committee seats were designated for a Student Senator. The committee discussed a possible referral to seats into changing all AS President or other AS Board member "designee." Chair Mathur will do a referral to O&G. O&G will work with the AS President on this referral.

4. Update from the President:

The President thanked Kathy Wong(Lau) for attending and speaking at the STOP AAPI HATE rally at San José City Hall on Saturday March 13th.

The President commented on the budget. They are beginning the hearings phase. It looks pretty certain that we will get the return of the \$299 million that was taken from us last year. However, we are less certain about the additional \$145 million we

asked for. Please continue lobbying. We may also get some one-time funds for deferred maintenance.

The American Rescue Act has two parts to the \$82 million received. About 50% of that monies will go out immediately in direct student aid. Of the remaining funds, \$5 million will be set aside for specific needs such as with

A: [President] I probably just haven't gotten to them yet. I'm not inclined to sign the F20-2 amendment with the inclusion of Summer. At some point we must return to the normal order.

C: Winter and Summer were added on the floor of the Senate. I&SA brought the resolution without it.

A: [President] I will probably return that one asking that Summer be removed. I'm good with Winter, but not summer. I will follow-up offline.

Q: What

I&SA continues to work on the Grade Forgiveness policy and trying to get Peoplesoft improvements.

I&SA recently received an Academic Integrity Policy referral.

- b. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
PS is working on the Lecturer policy and the Scholarship of Engagement Amendment to the

There

Executive Committee Minutes
April 5 , 2021
via Zoom, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

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

1. From the Chair:

Chair Mathur met with the Family Advisory Board and it was a wonderful opportunity to talk

billion in infrastructure needs. We are optimistic that we will get some one-time funding for infrastructure. We are pushing for a Public Institutions Infrastructure Package.

We are hard at work on a repopulation plan for the campus. University Personnel is doing a

C: Because of all the recent attacks on Asian people, I'm very concerned with all our students, faculty, and staff returning to campus.

Q: There was an incident a couple weeks ago where a student who is Asian was assaulted close to campus. Are we able to provide safety to our students, faculty, and staff in walking to campus?

A: The original report was filed with the San José Police Department, but it occurred on the edge of campus near 4th Street. We were able to look at surveillance information and track down and arrest the perpetrator the same day we got the information. This was really good hard work by our UPD.

b. From the AS President:

Voting in AS Elections will be held on April 12-13, 2021. A virtual meet and greet the candidates on Instagram will be held this week with debates following next week.

Please encourage students to sign-up for coffee with a faculty member through the Center for Faculty Development. The first 100 students to sign-up will receive coffee gift cards.

AS is working on renewing their operating agreement. The current agreement expires on June 30, 2021.

AS is also working on their staffing plan for Fall 2021.

Questions:

Q: When will the election results be available?

A:

A: There has been no additional news on the standardized tests. There was a real interest in not going back. The consensus among VPASA's is not to go back. With regard to FAFSA, what we know is that FAFSA completion rates vary across communities. There are some trends. Some communities have different perspectives around financial aid than others. I'll have to get back to you on where SJSU is specifically. It is a challenge.

C: It would be helpful to have a comparison of SJSU to other universities.

A: Sure, I'll look into where we are.

C: [President] Please tell them about your nomination.

A: [VPASA] Yes, I've been nominated by the CSU to the CA Student Aid Commission. There are some significant things proposed with regard to CAL Grants. There is a real interest in expanding CAL Grants.

C: Some of the reasons our students don't use FAFSA is that in some Latinx and Southeast Asian communities there is a fear that if you get financial aid you are in a mixed status family in terms of immigration status. This will require a lot of education to change these concerns/fears.

Q: Has there been any kind of exploration of what kind of communication is going to students from EAB? For example, if a student is reported to be at-risk for not completing the coursework. I haven't been answering, because there used to be a dropdown menu that had options for the faculty member like financial reasons, mental health reasons, etc. I'm wondering if they are getting communication from EAB about this and whether they might be also getting emails from others saying something like, "We understand you might be struggling financially, let us help."

A: [VPASA] We probably need to be looking at all communication to students. The Provost and I have been on three or four calls with them. We have spoken about communication and specifically how students are selected, how their model works, and how equity and race are used in their model. Yes, we are in the process of getting answers from them.

A [Provost] There is no messaging going to students from EAB. All messaging is done by SJSU. It is a tool with analytics behind it that does the work. What is interesting about that is different universities have selected different inputs to inform the algorithm. It is not an individually oriented tool, it is an aggregate tool.

If you are worried about what happens with the data, not much is being done with it right now. What the model is predicting right now is potential to graduate. Shockingly, the predictions look like the historical graduation rates of the institution, which show an equity gap in graduation between different populations.

The data is not widely used except for the VPASA's folks.

A: [Provost] It is critical that we train our advisers so they know as soon as they see the data where they need to reach out and provide help.

Q: How much are we paying for this tool we aren't using very much?

A: The CSU was paying for it initially, now we are. The problem is we don't have enough analytic people in front of it to use it effectively to target things.

d. From the Chief Diversity Officer (CDO):

The CDO and the Department of Nursing are partnering on an event on April 7th where they are looking at anti-racism and dismantling racism within Health and Human Sciences. It is a 3 hour conference. There are other CSUs attending that have

professional programs. It is being led by Dr. Michelle Hampton. We are bringing in guest speakers.

1 SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY
2 Instruction and Student Affairs Committee
3 April 19, 2021
4 Final Reading
5
6
7

AS 1814

22
23
24
25

Policy Recommendation
Amendment A to University Policy F20-1
Adding Classes after Advance Registration

- 70 Waitlists will be used to automatically enroll a course up to the enrollment cap. Students who
71 are on the top of waitlist may not be enrolled if they are not able to satisfy all necessary
72 conditions. These conditions may include the following:
- 73 x Waitlisted students will not be enrolled if they are enrolled in another section of the
74 course.
 - 75 x Waitlisted students will not be enrolled if they have a time conflict with another course.
 - 76 x Waitlisted students will not be enrolled if the additional units will cause the student to
77 exceed any maximum-unit limit that applies to the student, such as first-semester
freshman, first-- -

1 SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY
2 Academic Senate
3 Professional Standards Committee
4 April 19 , 2021
5 Final Reading

AS 1803

6
7 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
8 **Appointment, Evaluation, And Range Elevation**
9 **For Lecturer Faculty**

10

11 Rescinds: S10-7

12

13 Resolved: That S10-7 be rescinded and replaced by the following policy effective as
14 soon as administratively practicable.

15

16 Rationale: In 2018 Professional Standards received two referrals noting several
17 provisions in this policy that were obsolete, and in response began an in-
18 depth review. The committee discussed the policy directly with the Senior

43 achievement that they are not appointed to do. For example, there are
44 some lecturer faculty assigned to do service and research, but these are
45 rare, and most lecturer faculty are appointed strictly to teach. For lecturer
46 faculty assigned strictly to teach, materials on research or service would
47 be provided on a voluntary basis to the extent that the faculty member
48 desires to make the case that the activities enhance their teaching.

49
50 As the committee reviewed S10-7, it found numerous passages which
51 were obsolete, abstruse, unnecessary, and in some cases, insulting to
lecturer faculty.

79 APPOINTMENT, EVALUATION, AND RANGE ELEVATION
80 FOR LECTURER FACULTY

81
82 1. Introduction

83
84 1.1. Purpose

85
86 1.1.1. This policy covers the procedures for appointment,
87 reappointment, and evaluation (including range elevation) of Unit
88 3 faculty members serving a full-time or part-time Lecturer
appointment. This policy also establishes a procedure for creating 38 s poli (i)-0.6 (

123 1.3. Guidance

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131 1.4. Confidentiality

132

133

134

The University provides web-based resources of interest to lecturer faculty, and lecturer faculty are also strongly encouraged to seek guidance from their Department Chair for clarification of items covered by this policy, as well as other University policies and department practices.

All deliberations in the appointment and evaluation process are to be confidential. Confidentiality shall be maintained pursuant to applicable

166
167
168
169
170
171

3. Initial and Subsequent Appointments

3.1. Appointment Letters and Timing

3.1.1. Offers of appointment are to be made in writing by the Dean or the

210

3.3.1.

253
254
255
256
257
258
259

4.1.1. Notification. Lecturer faculty should be notified of evaluation criteria and procedures as per the CBA (15.3). Decision makers should be aware that the current CBA requires notification “no later than 14 days after the first day of instruction in the academic term.”

4.1.2. Purpose: The performance of lecturer faculty should be carefully evaluated in order to provide students with the best instruction on i259 or on on in

383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425

- 4.3.1. The most fundamental principle of the evaluation of lecturer faculty is that they be evaluated in terms of their particular assignment and the criteria appropriate to that assignment. For example, if a Lecturer Faculty is appointed to teach .8 and do service at .2, then 80% of the evaluation should focus on criteria appropriate to teaching and 20% on criteria appropriate to service. Such a Lecturer Faculty may not be evaluated directly on scholarship.
- 4.3.2. Many lecturer faculty have substantial accomplishments in areas that are not directly covered by their assignment—i.e., scholarship in the case of instructional lecturers. Such lecturer faculty should be encouraged to explain how these achievements have a bearing on teaching and thus could be considered as an enhancing factor in the evaluation of the actual assignment. Similarly, lecturers who contribute service should be encouraged to show how this activity enhances student success, campus climate, and/or their assigned activities. Asking for consideration of activities that may indirectly enhance the actual assignment will be at the option of lecturer faculty.
- 4.3.3. The evaluation of teaching must be holistic and in accordance with the University policy on the evaluation of teaching (F12-6.) “When evaluating effectiveness in teaching, chairs, committees, and administrators are required to conduct a holistic evaluation. This means that teaching must be considered in context and must be evaluated using multiple sources of information.” (F12-6). Such sources of information include the candidate’s own statements via the annual summary of achievements, course materials such as syllabi, direct observations, and student opinion surveys.
- 4.3.4. Certain assignments may require continued currency in a field and/or the maintenance of professional credentials, e.g., licensure in a professional field for accreditation requirements. Such requirements should be delineated in an appointment letter, and then may be evaluated as part of the assignment.
- 4.3.5. If colleges or departments develop any supplementary criteria (e.g. licensure, clinical practice experience, training required by accreditation) for evaluating lecturer faculty, these criteria shall not be changed until after the conclusion of the current evaluation process (CBA 15.3).

426
427
428

4.3.6. Lecturer faculty annual evaluations will be characterized using the following scale:

514 and administrative level evaluation recommendations
515 including rebuttal or response statements submitted, if
516 available. If the assignment was for greater than six years,
517 then only materials from the most recent six years are
518 required.

519 5.2.4.2. A comprehensive index of all materials shall be prepared by
520 the faculty member and submitted with the range elevation
521 materials.

522
523 5.2.5. Criteria

524
525 To be recommended for range elevation, a lecturer must
526 demonstrate professional growth and development appropriate to
527 the lecturer's work assignment and the mission of the university
528 during the period between the date of initial appointment or, where
529 applicable, the date of the last range elevation and the time of the
530 current request. Accumulated teaching experience alone is not a
531 criterion for range elevation. This is the only review period in which
532 candidates' professional achievements shall be evaluated. Appendix
533 A lists examples of activities that may be used to demonstrate
534 appropriate professional growth and development.

535
536 5.2.6. Levels of achievement

537
Higher level of advancement (such as from C to D) require 4 (s)-6 -16.6 (ge)0.7 (

557 separate review, shall do the same. The recommendations will be
558 forwarded to the candidate who will have a ten-day period to submit
559 a written rebuttal or response, if desired. The recommendation(s)
560 and rebuttal will then be forwarded to the Dean.

561
562 5.2.8. Review Process—Dean: The Dean will review the recommendations
563 of the department and make a recommendation. A copy of the
564 recommendation will be sent to the candidate who will have ten days
565 to respond in writing. The recommendations and candidate
566 responses (if any) will then be forwarded to UP-FS and the Provost
567 for final review and action.

568
569 5.2.9. Decision by the President. The result of the reviews by the
570 department and Dean is to deliver a recommendation to the Provost
571 for the President's final decision with respect to the request for range
572 elevation. The President may choose to delegate authority to decide
573 in whole or in part to the Provost.

574
575 5.2.10. Effective date of range elevation: Range elevation salary increases
576 shall be effective as indicated in the CBA (12.16).

577
578 5.2.11. Peer Review Process: Denial of a range elevation is subject to
579 appeal to a Peer Review Panel. UP-FS shall establish a single Peer
580 Review Panel consisting of three full-time tenured faculty (not
581 including faculty in the FERP program) who have served on
582 committees in the preceding academic year that made
583 recommendations on matters of retention, tenure, and promotion
584 and who have attained the rank of full professor or equivalent.
585 Faculty services shall select at random from the eligible full-time
586 tenured faculty three (3) members and one (1) alternate for service
587 on the Peer Review Panel. A member of the Peer Review Panel
588 may not hear an appeal of a range elevation denial if he/she is in
589 the same department as the appealing lecturer. Relevant dates and
590 steps in the peer review process are explained below.

591
5.2.11.1.

600 written materials it considered. The decision of the Peer
601 Review Panel shall be final and binding.

602

603 5.3. Range Elevation Amount

604

605 5.3.1. Range elevation for lecturer faculty shall be accompanied by an
606 advancement in salary of a minimum of 5% (or to the minimum of the next
607 range) (Article 31.6).

608

609 5.3.2. Deans may recommend an increase greater than the minimum called for
610 in the CBA and shall provide reasoning for such to the Provost. The decision
611 to award a range elevation greater than the minimum is at the final
612 discretion of the Provost.

- 654 · leadership in faculty governance, including the Academic Senate and its
- 655 committees, campus life at the department, college, university, CSU
- 656 system level, and CFA leadership.
- 657 · maintenance and technical support of university labs, equipment,
- 658 materials, supplies, safety standards and any other support of
- 659 environments that require advanced professional attention
- 660 · mentoring of colleagues
- 661 · organizing events and activities for the sharing of ideas and knowledge
- 662 · recruitment and retention of students
- 663 · research and/or creative activity in the discipline thesis research and
- 664 supervision
- 665

666 3. Research related

- 667 · collaborative research and creative activity involving the campus and the
- 668 community
- 669 · editing of publications
- 670 · participation at professional meetings and presentations at conferences
- 671 · contributions to the community, including professional efforts which bring
- 672 the community and the campus together
- 673 · publications, exhibitions, and/or performances that advance knowledge
- 674 · research and/or creative activity in discipline related pedagogy
- 675 · patents and innovations credited to the lecturer

676

677 Appendix B
678

719 honorific titles may be used when a Visiting Faculty has earned such a
720 title at a prior institution.
721
722 · Distinguished Visiting Lecturer or Distinguished Visiting Professor.
723 These are honorific titles that may be used as subsets of the Visiting
724 Faculty designation of the CBA. These designations are reserved for
725 visitors with particularly distinguished careers, and must be approved by
726 the Provost after a request from the appropriate college Dean which
727 documents the qualifications and contributions that warrant this title.
728
729 · Distinguished Visiting Scholar. This is an honorific title that may be used
730 as a subset of the Visiting Scholar designation of the CBA. This
731 designation is reserved for visiting scholars with particularly
732 distinguished careers, and must be approved by the Provost after a
733 request from the appropriate college Dean which documents the
734 qualifications and contributions that warrant this title.
735
736 · Senior Lecturer—This is an honorific title that may be used as a subset
737 of the Lecturer designation of the CBA. SJSU bestows this honorific title
738 to a lecturer faculty member with a three year appointment and six
739 consecutive years of experience in a single department at SJSU.
740

1 SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY
2 Academic Senate
3 Organization and Government Committee
4 April 19, 2021
5 Final Reading
6

AS 1816

7
Policy Recommendation
Amendment C ~~11071(c) 08.2~~

SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY
Academic Senate
Curriculum and Research Committee
April 19, 2021
Final Reading

AS 1807

POLICY RECOMMENDATION

Amendment D to University Policy S14 -5

Modification of Guidelines for General Education (GE), American Institutions (AI),
and the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR)

Amends: S14-5 and 2014 GE Guidelines

Whereas: Amendment C to University Policy S14-5 was signed by the President to create a 3-unit GE Area F and reduce the GE Area D unit requirement from 9 units to 6 units to bring SJSU in alignment with California Education Code 89032; and

Whereas: ~~Amendment C to University Policy S14-5 was signed by the President to create a 3-unit GE Area F and reduce the GE Area D unit requirement from 9 units to 6 units to bring SJSU in alignment with California Education Code 89032; and~~
x" (S Da 0 • A q Fe a D a n d A r e a F c r i e s i s 2 n d 7 0 0 i m p e m e n t e d b y F a l l 2 0 2 1 , 2 b u t m o r e t i m e i s n e e d e d t o g a t h e r f e e d b a c k a n d r e v i e w t h e o t h e r a r e a s o f t h e G E G u i d e l i n e s , t h e r e f o r e b e i t

Resolved: The Academic Senate recommends that Presidential Directive 2019-01 be rescinded; and be it further

Resolved: That the attached Area D language, replacing the Area D language in the 2014 GE Guidelines, shall be adopted effective Fall 2021; and be it further

Resolved: That the attached Area F language shall be inserted into the 2014 GE Guidelines and shall be adopted effective Fall 2021; and be it further

Resolved: That Curriculum and Research Committee will continue the full review of the 2014 Guidelines considering all feedback that has been given; and be it further

Resolved: That Undergraduate Education Office will collaborate with the Chancellor's Office and departments to determine and implement a curricular solution for programs that would exceed the 120 unit limit because of changes to Areas D and F.

Appendix

Area D: Social Sciences

6 semester units

NOT

C. Content

1. Courses shall include fundamental skills necessary to the practice of social science.
2. Courses shall teach students how to practice social science, not just understand what social scientists have concluded.
3. Course content shall develop students' analytical skills and understanding of social science in ways that develop the capacity for informed civic engagement.

Diversity Requirement

Issues of diversity shall be incorporated in an appropriate manner.

Writing Requirement

The minimum writing requirement is 1500 words in a language and style appropriate to the discipline.

American Institutions Requirement

Area D courses may meet American Institutions requirements if they:

1. focus on cultural pluralism; and
2. meet the criteria for American Institutions and Area D.

Instructor qualifications

1. an understanding and appreciation of general education;
2. a doctorate (preferred but not required);
3. college-level teaching experience or graduate training in the subject matter of the course; and
4. sections designed for foreign students require substantial formal training and experience in teaching speakers of other languages, in addition to above requirements; and
- 5.

F: Ethnic Studies Requirement

The Area F requirement is based on the premise tha

1. Analyze and articulate concepts such as race and racism, racialization, ethnicity, equity, ethno-centrism, eurocentrism, white supremacy, self-determination, liberation,

Writing requirement

The minimum writing requirement is 1500 words in a language and style appropriate to the discipline. All writing shall be assessed for grammar, clarity, conciseness, and coherence.

Class size

Lower division courses shall be limited to 40 students.

Supplementary assistance

Some students may require special or more assistance than the regular class can provide. In such cases, faculty shall refer the student to the appropriate program for special or supplementary assistance.

Instructor qualifications

1. A thorough understanding of the Area F general education requirements and its implementation;
2. a doctorate (preferred but not required) in ethnic studies or related fields such as: Native American Studies (NAS/AIS), African American Studies (AFAM), Asian American Studies (AAS), and Chicanx/Latinx Studies (CCS) ;
3. college-level teaching experience or graduate

SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY
Academic Senate
Instruction and Student Affairs Committee
April 19, 2021
Final Reading

AS 1815

Policy Recommendation

Amendment A to University Policy F20-2, Grading Changes to Support Maximum Flexibility for SJSU Students During the Prolonged COVID-19 Pandemic

Whereas: The Chancellor's Office has raised concern with the grade changes called for in F20-2 related to automatic adjustment of Unauthorized Withdrawal (WU) grades to Withdrawal (W) grades; and

1
2 SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY
3 Academic Senate
4 Professional Standards Committee
5 April 19, 2021
6 Final Reading
7

AS 1812

8 **SENSE OF THE SENATE RESOLUTION**
9 **Expressing Support for**
10 **Reform of RTP for Fairness, Equity, and Inclusion**
11 **To be carried out by the Professional Standards Committee**
12 **AY 2021-2022**
13
14

15 Resolved: The Academic Senate of San José State University receives the attached
16 report by the Professional Standards Committee entitled “Roadmap for
17 Equity Reform of RTP policies;” be it further
18

19 Resolved: The Academic Senate endorses the approach outlined in the “Roadmap”
20 and looks forward to reviewing the particular policy recommendations that

34
35 Roadmap for Equity Reform of RTP policies
36 The Professional Standards Committee
37 April 2021
38

39 Overview and Rationale:
40

41 In AY 2020-2021, the Professional Standards Committee began the process of examining
42 our Retention, Tenure, and Promotion policies to better promote fairness, equity, and
43 inclusion in the retention, tenure, and promotion of our faculty. While our university has
44 spearheaded various initiatives to recruit diverse faculty, progress in faculty diversification
45 has been slow. As noted in our report from Spring 2020, the University needs to carefully
46 examine how it supports our diverse faculty as they transition through the various career
47 stages laid out in the CBA and University policy.¹
48

49 The Professional Standards Committee is concerned that our RTP policies lack
50 sufficiently specific language about fairness, equity, and inclusion. The obsolete policy
51 (S98-8) referred to educational equity, but this reference and other related paragraphs
were not carried forward into the new policy (S15-8.11.3 (e)6 ()0.7 (()-5.3 (S)-4.7 4dnI4D-22.7 (y)1d .00

82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108

Consultation and Information Gathering:

To undertake a careful review of our RTP Policies with an eye on fairness, equity and inclusion will require consulting with a broad range of members of our University community. The Professional Standards Committee is committed to consulting with groups and individuals throughout the campus community. The following list is far from exhaustive:

1. BIPOC faculty: three focus group meetings each with a focus on different areas of achievement: Academic Assignment, Service, RSCA. Separate groups should focus on assistant professors vs. ranks
2. The Faculty Diversity Committee
3. Center for Faculty Development
4. Campus Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
5. Director of Black and African American Equity, Patience Bryant. Director Bryant has received and shared correspondence (e.g. Black Spartan Advisory Council, APIFSA)
6. UCCD: may be beneficial to break it out as focus groups on three different areas, Academic Assignment, Service, RSCA
7. Past RTP evaluators from college and university committees
8. Individuals who have just gone through the RTP process
9. Consultation with faculty more generally
10. Additional groups yet to be identified

Timeline for Reform:

123 Appendix A:

124

125 Materials consulted to date:

126

127 Asian Pacific Islander Faculty and Staff Association, letter to President Papazian and
128 SJSU Community, July 28, 2020.

129

130 Belong @ SJSU survey results. <https://www.sjsu.edu/belong/findings/index.php>

131

132 Black Spartan Community, letter to President Papazian, August 25, 2020.

133

Gibson, Amerlia M.

161 Appendix B:

162
163 First reading presented to the Senate on February 8, 2021, with committee edits
164 from February 15, 2021

165
166
167 POLICY RECOMMENDATION

168 Amending S15 -8

169 University Policy, Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees:
170 Criteria and Standards
171 To enhance service to students

172
173

174 1.4.1

175 2.0 Categories of Achievement:

176

177 2.4 Service

178 2.4.1 The third basic category for evaluation is service. Contributions in
179 service are expected for continuation and advancement in the
180 University. All faculty have an obligation to contribute to the
181 governance of the institution, ~~and~~ to enhance the surrounding
182 community, and to contribute to our core mission of providing equal
183 educational opportunities for our diverse students.

184 2.4.2 Types of Service. For ease of reference only, service may be divided
185 into several areas. Examples:

186 2.4.2.1 Service to students. Service to students. Advising,
187 mentoring, and participating in activities to enhance student
188 learning and success that are not subsumed in teaching or
189 the primary academic assignment. ~~that go beyond the~~
190 curriculum.

191 2.4.2.2 Service to the University. Participation in the Academic
192 Senate and its committees, search and review committees,
193 program coordinators and part-time department chairs,
194 leadership in the California Faculty Association,
195 membership in the Academic Senate of the CSU, work on
196 system-wide committees and task forces, administrative
197 activities (to the extent that such assignments are not the
198 primary academic assignment), and participation in
199 campus organizations and clubs of benefit to faculty or
200 students.

2.4.2.3

207 as editor of a professional journal or newsletter;
208 adjudicator, reviewer for publishers or other agencies and
209 associations. Public lectures, newspaper editorials,
210 television or radio analysis, honors and awards. Active
211 participation or leadership in disciplinary or professional
212 associations; organizing panels, activities or workshops.
213 Serving in accreditation or other discipline-based review
214 capacities, Service to K-14 educational segments.

215 2.4.2.5 Educational equity activities. Providing support to
216 historically underserved students, helping to shrink the

a Tf -0.006 Tc 016.7 (a)-16.6 (l)-0.7 ()0.7 (s)-6 (eg)-1.7 ()0.7 (t-11.3 (uder

255 baseline level of achievement for promotion to Professor will also include at
256 least some service at the University level.

257
258 3.3.3.4 Good. In addition to the baseline described above, the candidate has
259 documented extensive and effective engagement in one or more service
260 categories. The nature of this documentation will vary depending on the nature
261 of the service, but in all cases the service must be described and evaluated by
262 faculty, administrators, students, or community members in a position to
263 understand its importance and impact. Service at this level will usually
264 transcend basic department functions and may include college-level service,
265 University level service, service in the community, significant activities in a
266 professional organization, engagement with students and student
267 organizations, and effective educational equity activities.

268
269 3.3.3.5 ~~Good. In addition to the baseline described above, the candidate has also~~
270 ~~participated in significant service activities beyond the department. This will~~
271 ~~usually include college-level service and may include University level service,~~
272 ~~service in the community, or significant activities in a professional organization.~~
273 ~~In at least one facet of service, the candidate will have demonstrated leadership~~
274 ~~resulting in tangible, documented achievements.~~

275
276 3.3.3.6 Excellent. In addition to a good performance as described above, the candidate
277 has documented significant influence at a high level characterized by
278 leadership in one or more service areas. For University service, candidates will
279 generally have occupied several elected or appointed positions of leadership.
280 For service to students, to the community, and towards educational equity,

8 Amendment B to S16-8

9 Revision to University Policy, Selection and Review of Administrator

10
11 Amends: University Policy S16-8

12
13 Effective : Immediately

14
15 Whereas: Library staff comprise two-thirds of library employees and are responsible
16 for the complex and ever-changing infrastructure that supports the library's
17 services and resources; and

18
19 Whereas: Increasing staff representation on the committee that chooses the library
20 dean would bring a valuable perspective to the search as well as increase
21 equity in representation; and

22
23 Whereas: The faculty majority on the committee may be maintained by increasing
24 faculty representation; therefore be it

25
26 Resolved : That Article 1.3.2 of S16-8, be amended as follows: "The search
27 committee shall be composed of eleven members: four faculty librarians
28 selected by and from the faculty librarians; two Library staff members,
29 selected by the staff of the university library; one department chair from
30 outside the library; one faculty member (not a chair) from outside the
31 library; one student, one Dean (from outside the Library), and one member
32 of the community, each designated by the Provost. The committee chair,
33 ideally a faculty member, shall be appointed by the Provost.

34
35 Approved : April 5, 2021

36 Vote: 12-0-0

37 Present : Altura, Birrer, de Bourbon, Grosvenor, Higgins, Maciejewski,
38 McClory, Millora, Okamoto, Sasikumar, Taylor, Thompson

39 Absent : None

40 Financial impact : None anticipated

41 Workload impact : None anticipated

1 SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY
2 Academic Senate
3 Curriculum and Research Committee
4 April 19, 2021
5 First Reading
6

AS 1810

7 POLICY RECOMMENDATION

8 Amendment E to University Policy S14 -5

9 Adopting new Program Learning Outcomes for General Education

10

11 Amend s: S14-5 and 2014 GE Guidelines

12

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

17

18 Whereas: General Education underwent a program review in Academic Year 2016-
19 17 with a notable recommendation that a taskforce be created to oversee
20 developing an “overall model for GE Assessment”; and

21

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

80 Goal 2: To enact the university's commitment to diversity, inclusion, and justice
81 by ensuring that students have opportunities to serve and contribute to the well -
82 being of local and global communities and the environment. Goal 2 has two
83 learning outcomes (PLOs 6 and 7):
84

1 SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY
2 Academic Senate
3 Professional Standards Committee
4 April 19, 2021
5 Final Reading

AS 1813

6
7 SENSE OF THE SENATE RESOLUTION
8 Endorsement of
9 The University of CniagTj /TT0 .6 (t)-8.6 0px.6 (U)-5.4yee4 C5 freedom o

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

- 12 Whereas: Academic Freedom is a cherished value and a necessary condition for the
13 work of a University; and
- 15 Whereas: Numerous threats to Academic Freedom from across the political spectrum
16 have emerged in recent years; and
- 18 Whereas: The Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act of 1979 (HEERA)
19 and the Collective Bargaining Agreement support academic freedom in
20 teaching, research, and learning through the free exchange of ideas among
21 the faculty, students, and staff of the Californian State University; and
whereas

The words of Harper, Hutchins, Levi, and Gray capture both the spirit and the promise of the University of Chicago. Because the University is committed to free and open inquiry in all matters, it guarantees all members of the University community the broadest possible latitude to speak, write, listen, challenge, and learn. Except insofar as limitations on that freedom are necessary to the functioning of the University, the University of Chicago fully respects and supports the freedom of all members of the University community.

Of course, the ideas of different members of the University community will often and quite naturally conflict. But it is not the proper role of the University to attempt to shield individuals from ideas and opinions they find unwelcome, disagreeable, or even deeply offensive. Although the University greatly values civility, and although all members of the University community share in the responsibility for maintaining

ay individuals

as sel t()] TJ ETd q 0.0000

ilmna(e)] TbfET Q q 0.000009120612792metuWf n BT /F4 14.04Ue 760d) 3(1-34.74

tpreat

rate,

speakers who are invited to express their views on campus, they may not obstruct or