

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.

Ex Officio: Present: Van Selst, Curry, Rodan, Mathur, McKee, Delgadillo Absent: None	CHHS Representatives: Present: Grosvenor, Sen, Smith, Schultz-Krohn Absent: None
---	---

Administrative Representatives:
 Present: Day, Faas, Del Casino, Wong(Lau) Marachi
 Absent: None

Students: Present: Kaur, Quock, Chuang, Gomez, Birrer Absent: Walker	ENGR Representatives: Present: Sullivan-Green, Saldamli, Okamoto Absent: None
Alumni Representative: Absent: Walters	H&A Representatives: Present: Kitajima, Khan, Frazier, Taylor, Thompson, Riley Absent: None
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 Absent: Raman
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 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 Army-5.7 (C)-0.7 (3mmC P 5.6t)5T0 Tc e21.15 T0

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 amended (46-0-0).**

Q: I had a question about compensation, whether assigned time or stipend can be provided. Have you had 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) (7) - (C), (b) (7) - (D), (b) (7) - (E), (b) (7) - (F), (b) (7) - (G), (b) (7) - (H), (b) (7) - (I), (b) (7) - (J), (b) (7) - (K), (b) (7) - (L), (b) (7) - (M), (b) (7) - (N), (b) (7) - (O), (b) (7) - (P), (b) (7) - (Q), (b) (7) - (R), (b) (7) - (S), (b) (7) - (T), (b) (7) - (U), (b) (7) - (V), (b) (7) - (W), (b) (7) - (X), (b) (7) - (Y), (b) (7) - (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) Up to 067 (ow) 66 (ch) T227 (4) (all) -0163 (de) 66 (i) 40.017 (3) (63) 61 (p) (ed) (03 (es) 6 (s) 022.

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

A: