

SAN7/TT0 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: Pres: 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	COSS 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.

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.

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 7 >>BDC /TT2 1 Tf -tioudeQo Tc 0.0>>BDC /TT2ile a pass/no pass option, b have a credi 0.0>>BDC /TT2n0 there have >>BDC /TT2 options around the i(i)-0.7 (o)-16e regardi 0.06 (ng)0.7 (t)-11.4 (hi 0.06 (s)-6 ()0.6 (i 0.06 (s)-6 (f -)0.7 (ue.)

They have gotten wd

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

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

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.

A: Correct.
Q:

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. U(5)]TJ 0 e[i6 (vo)- (e)12 ()0r-5.6 ()0.6 f a(S)-5.6 ()0.6 (</MCID 1B-11 (at-11Tj 0.006 Tc [

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 (

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 satis.4 (e)JTJ -23.2 6 (ent) 9 >>BDC -0.006 to entidenC(s)-6 (.40.6 23x6

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

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.3 (a

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.

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 inform the department (pr)-6.3((ut)-11.4(i)-0.6 (X) Tw 23(367102((Q)

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 (his) Blanchard and his staff. There is reluctance on the part of the Chancellor's pd reould be

Questions:
C: