







#### **D. Professional Standards Committee (PS): No Report**

#### **E. University Library Board (ULB):**

Nada Attar and Edger Bering presented **AS 1869, Amendment E to University Policy S15-10, Revisions to SJSU Library Policy (First Reading)**

#### **Questions:**

Q: Lines 277-300 are outdated and were changed in 2019. Is that correct?

A: This is a copy of the working policy that we got from the Senate website. We will have to defer to the appropriate chair of the policy research if the part needs to be updated or not on the Senate

Q: How is the department determined?

A: determining the department is aligned with existing practice not dictated by policy.

Q: Would it be possible to specifically add language in the criteria for selection withdrawal for the significance of a book? It seems to be only implied right now. Concerning 7.2.4, how are the books being donated because they are sometimes just recycled instead?

A: The criteria are mainly discussed in the department and librarians' consultation, but we could add a recommendation of significant criteria. The library has an increasing relationship with global nonprofits to ensure books go to places that otherwise would not have such resources.

Q: Line 326 was deleted. Was it added somewhere else?

A: (Meth) It is more of a procedure change. The report can be viewed on the library website, where I post my reports in detail, and it is regularly updated.

C: Section 3 of this policy is incredible micromanaging of the library. I can't imagine trying to apply something like this to faculty in the classroom. Imagine reading this as an academic librarian. It is telling you what to do all day from a policy perspective. Consider if we need a policy about what the ULB does and how it interacts with the library.

A: You are in line with your librarians, and we are happy to take it back to the committee and delete some parts.

C: I was a principal author of a lot of the policy. I am happy to come to the ULB meeting and explain where much of this came from. It was a cut and paste of many other policies before the joint library. 1-3 got written for the joint library to guarantee that our academic mission would remain. Section 7 originated in 1996

in the Senate. A historical example was used to explain why a university-side consultation is needed rather than department by department.

Q: When withdrawing a book, are we ensuring that the material is accessible in some way so we do not lose any knowledge?

A: We rely on our CSU-wide collaborations, so ensure this.

A;(Meth) The SJCL offers a reference service on the third floor, which SJSU students and faculty can use. The SJSU reference service has moved online, so we prioritize helping people all over. We have so many materials in our collections that probably shouldn't be there. We are not a collection of records, and because we have a connection with the other CSUs globally, we can still get materials here if they aren't. Concerning the department-based consultation, those not in the department and using the text should already have a relationship with the library so they can be informed. It's not foolproof, but we need to modernize the system.

### **VIII. Special Committee Reports:**

Report on NAGPRA/CalNAGPRA by Provost Del Casino

**NAGPRA:** Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act is a federal law, and CalNAGPRA is the California version of that. Their sole purpose is reappreciating native american human remains and culture-affiliated materials. The state audited the system, and CSU and SJSU did very well last year. After AB275 had passed, the dean of anthropology came and said that we needed more resources to hire more people to support the law. That is where Alisha Marie Ragland's position came from, and we pulled the whole program from the College of Social Science and moved it to the Office of the Provost. The report gives a sense of the collection, what has been done so far, and the issues going on. A key point in the law is that you have to follow the tribe. The entire process is set up for tribal consultations. So far, we have had 40 consultations with 18 different tribes since 2021. However, there is tension between federal law and state law since federal law governs federally recognized tribes. The decertification of federal tribes affected a lot of CA tribes. The CA was designed to give culturally affiliated CA tribes agency. However, everything in our collection is now at the federal level, and the federal tribes get priority and oversight. The state auditors did not understand some of the nuances and gave aggressive timelines, but SJSU met all deadlines and was affiliated with all the laws, but then the rules changed. Lastly, under AB358, a 1.0, 12-month, full-time NAGPRA coordination is required, and we are in the process of developing that position.



C: From the the perspective of a student, this whole process and system is very confusing to a lot of us. On the surface level, CAL-GETC sounds good as a student in relation to transferring. We know CAL-GET needs to be worked on

A: There is a collection of resolutions at the statewide level being accumulated.

C: On March 27, it is on the board of trustees for a final reading, and then they will change Title 5 regardless of our position. I think it is very symbolic that all the CSU senates have passed similar resolutions, but it's only symbolic.

C: There is some hope that the board might change its mind or even postpone the decision.

C: At all 23 campuses, students have also come out against the tuition increase.

Sense of Senate passed 37-0-3.

**X. State of the University Announcements:**

**A. CSU Statewide Representative(s)**

I sent out a two-page report prior to the meeting, so please take a look at that. As my fellow CSU senators mentioned, there was a discussion that included some of the members of the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor's office, and my takeaway from both those presentations was that senators have a lot to say, and there was silence. Whenever there is silence, I worry because it tells me they are not listening; they do not care. Many times, our senators have addressed the







