

**2018/2019 Academic Senate**

**MINUTES**  
**February 11, 2019**

**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.**

**Ex Officio:**

Present: Frazier, Van Selst, Manzo,  
Lee, J., Rodan

**Administrative Representatives:**

Present: Ficke, Wong(Lau),  
Faas, Papazian  
Absent: Day

**Deans / AVPs:**

Present: Olin, Ehrman, Elliott, Stacks  
Absent: None

**Students:**

Present: Fernandez-Rios, Gallo, Gill  
Kethepalli, Pang, Rodriguez  
Absent: None

Award for Service. Senator Curry received a standing ovation.

**B. From the President of the University** – d(ur)3 ding(t)-2 (ve)4 ov(e)4 (r)3 nmte(t)-2 sftw **a**

Q: Can you discuss how programs that are heavily weighted with graduate programs, or that have only graduate programs, are articulated with the current college or the newly created College of Graduate Studies?

A: The College of Graduate Studies is a vehicle to work with all the colleges around graduate education. The President deferred to the Provost.

C: Pr

and will try and normalize the process over the next two years. I have the feeling your dean is already having these conversations about the library's budget needs right now.

Q: There is a lot of anxiety in my college and department from faculty over the amount of changes that are occurring so rapidly and it appears to them to be without their input. Would it be possible to get an idea about what other seismic changes will occur?

A: Provost: It was my understanding when I came in that there had been considerable conversations in the college about the name change, and it became the College of Health and Human Sciences. Subsequently, there was a leadership change. I don't talk about personnel changes. What I did do was meet with the department chairs in January and spoke about their need to focus on who they wanted to be and what that looked like. The substance of that conversation was this should be organic, and should be a conversation that is held with faculty. I made the wrong assumption that the chairs would discuss this with their faculty. I repeatedly asked the chairs to have conversations with their faculty and have decisions organically made about who you are, where you want to be, and what that should look like. I met with your dean this morning and she spoke with me specifically about Social Work and the need to satisfy accrediting requirements having to do with size and advanced standing. Advanced standing needs to meet accrediting standards in Social Work, and this will govern some of your decisions about how you



seconded and approved by the Executive Committee on January 28, 2019.]

**The Senate voted and the calendar was approved with 2 Nays and 6 Abstentions.**

**V. Unfinished Business:** None

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

**A. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):**

Senator White presented *AS 1718, Policy Recommendation, Amendment C to S14-5, Modification to General Education Area D (Final Reading)*.

Senator Peter presented an amendment to add to the end of the first whereas clause, "...The Chancellor's Office requires an immediate change to our General Education Area D curriculum. The Senate has been informed that a change will be imposed if we do not produce a compliant policy recommendation; and". The amendment was seconded. Senator Peter presented an amendment to the amendment that was friendly to the body to move it to the end of the second whereas clause. Senator Van Selst presented an amendment to the Peter Amendment that was friendly to the body to change it to read, "The Chancellor's Office has informed SJSU that a change will be imposed if it does not produce a compliant policy recommendation; and". Senator Papazian expressed concern that she felt the amendment belonged in a separate Sense of the Senate Resolution, and that the policy amendment should contain only curricular changes. Senator White called the question. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the question was called with 4 Nays and 8 Abstentions. The Senate voted and the Peter-Van Selst Amendment passed with 1 Nay and 5 Abstentions. Senator Rodan presented an amendment to a new Whereas clause to read, "Whereas, the Academic Senate does not believe that the removal of the requirement for distribution of units over the three Area D sub areas is in the best interest of students;". The Rodan amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Rodan amendment failed (3 Ayes, 5 abstentions). Senator Khan presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change section 1) to read, "Students may choose, from at least two different curricular disciplines, ...". Senator Van Selst presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to the Khan Amendment to change it to read, "Students may choose, from a minimum of two disciplines or in an interdisciplinary sequence, ...". **The Senate voted and AS 1718 passed as amended (19-17-5).**

**B.**

Senator Shifflett presented a motion to extend the clock to finish this item. The Shifflett motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the clock was extended.

**Questions:**

Q: Would the committee consider revising the sentence that begins, “faculty may choose to exclude the survey results from one course per year...”? For lecturers, it is not one academic year, it is one calendar year so it would be spring and fall. This would mean if lecturers were teaching 15 units in the spring, you could exclude one class. I’d like for the committee to consider revising that.

A: The committee will consider this.

Q: Would you clarify when SOTES are collected for special sessions, I know there is uneven collection of special session data?

A: We just communicated that concern to SERB that oversees SOTES. They weren’t aware of this problem so stronger enforcement is on the way.

Q: In the language where it describes, “at least fifteen WTUs (equivalent of five three unit courses),” you don’t make a distinction between C or S classification. Is there a difference?

A: Not so far in policy, but if you’d like to send us some language we will look at it.

Q: So, as it stands supervisory courses would count in the WTUs?

A: I believe they do now, but WTUs were introduced as a way to try and explain to faculty how much they would need to teach before they could exclude a course.

Q: In the sentence where it says, “Faculty, however, under some circumstances may exclude the results of an occasional course from their periodic evaluations,” can you





time to be announced. In the next several months the plan will be finalized and implementation will begin. The Strategic Planning Steering Committee will continue to operate, monitor, and report on the plan and its implementation. The Co-Chairs of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee are happy with the plan and seek the Senate's endorsement.

Dean Jacobs thanked Senators for their input during this long process. One of the priorities of the committee was to be as inclusive as possible so that is why it took longer than anticipated. We got a lot of feedback and went through multiple drafts.

**Questions:**

**Q:** Did the SPSC have input into the mission statement? If not, will the SPSC have input into it?

**A:** Everything before page 11 has been added. We sent what starts on page 11 forward to the President's Office and this is what was returned. That includes the mission statement.

**A: President:** The mission statement came about from the spirit of all the feedback from the campus. The SPSC will have a final chance to review.

**Q:** The current mission statement is passive about engaging students as partners on the campus.

**A:** Please send language or suggestions for changes to Chair Frazier or Dean Jacobs.

**Q:** In the first 11 pages of the document, there are three mentions of teaching and about 20 mentions of research. Could you clarify what does that mean for the mission of SJSU? Also, what does it suggest to students that come to SJSU for teaching that there is so little mention of teaching?

**A:** We only received the first 10 pages and haven't had time to review them. However, if you can forward that to me we will make it a point of discussion.

**Q:** Can you clarify the mechanics of the process by which the goals will be made into action items?

**A:** The implementation plan is the next phase and will be ordered by the President. Certain aspects of each plan get one point person and that person will be tasked with creating an implementation plan. If you go to the final page there are a number of links and one of the links points to the five documents sent to the President's Office in October by the SPSC. What remains of each of those documents from page 11 on is the first page of each of those documents. The rest of it, all the fine print below, is a whole bunch of details in order to show why the SPSC came to the decisions it did and included with that are a number of implementation suggestions.

**Q:** Related to the outcomes, in the initial statements there are comments and mention of faculty, but in the desired outcomes there is very little said recognizing the support and outcomes directly related to faculty. As the President said in her remarks, there is no student success without faculty success. It would be desirable to see some of those outcomes reflect faculty in a little bit more direct way. It would be great to see some faculty success directly

indicated in some of those things. My second question is if there is a plan to ensure the taskforce plays a role in the implementation and evaluation of the Strategic Plan moving forward?

A: We could do that. The taskforce members themselves would probably beg not to have to do more work. There are lots of people involved in the implementation.

A: President: What we hope to do over the next few months is that this plan be effective 2019-2029, and would be launched on July 1, 2019. Clearly, there is a role for the steering committee, but taskforces do their work then go away. The Strategic Plan must inform every decision we make at the university. This becomes the way the performance would be evaluated over the course of a year. I also envision metrics, both quantitative and qualitative. I envision my Chief of Staff being the point person for the campus.

Q: I just think that it is very important to have some of the taskforce members be on the SPSC.

Q: Having served on two strategic planning adventures at SJSU, I would like to congratulate all of you. There are two issues I would like to raise. Did you do an environmental scan? Also, was any kind of threat assessment done about what could get in the way of accomplishing the goals? In 2008, when the budget was cut across the board, the strategic plan went out the door. If our strategic plan can't serve us in times of crisis, it has absolutely no utility whatsoever.

A: We didn't do anything like a threat assessment as part of the SPSC, but built into the BAC and SPSC policy is a strong communication between the two. All of the plan needs resources and monitoring and in terms of how resources get allocated, there has already been a great deal of communication between the two committees.

A: President: We hav 7 >>BDC 4 (: P)-2(om)-2-1 (t)-2 (ri)-2 (n)-10 (g)1 7-2 (n t)-e stroee.C 3ft: Wiot

sometimes it might cost us. There is no one size fits all. The decision has to be weighed against what is best.

Senator Peter presented a motion to endorse the Strategic Plan on pages 11 through 21 of the document. The motion was seconded. **The Senate voted and the motion passed unanimously.**

---