

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

Present: Alison McKee (Chair), Anoop Kaur, Brandon White, Julia Curry, Karthika Sasikumar, Kimb Massey, Laura Sullivan-Green, Ravisha Mathur, Vincent Del Casino (12:15 p.m.), Winifred Schultz-Krohn, Charlie Faas, Patrick Day, Tabitha Hart, Kathleen Wong(Lau)

Absent: Mary Papazian

Agenda Item 8: Consent Calendar of November 15, 2021

1.006

T.4

(:)]TJTc

0.012

Tw

of November 15, 2021, Consent Calendar of November 15, 2021 as presented by AVC Massey, Executive Committee Minutes of October 4, October 18, and October 25, 2021 (14-0-0).

President of University Advancement, Theresa Davis, and AVP of Advancement and Campaign Operations, Beth Colbert, presented proposed members for the Honorary Degree Committee. Each year every CSU campus is required to present names to the Chancellor's Office to receive the honorary doctoral degree. The purpose of this committee is to review those names recommended by each campus and make recommendations to the president. The president must approve her nominations to the Chancellor's Office by December 3, 2021. The Chancellor's Office will then review and select recipients at their meeting in January.

Q: How were the proposed honorary doctoral nominees selected? How are nominees recommended in a number of different ways. To begin with, there is always a list of nominees leftover from previous years. Two of the nominees on the Chancellor's list were left over from previous nominees. Also, some nominees are made as recommendations from the Board of Trustees.

A: We took a look at the people that were recommended for the award and the recommended committee members before you are representing people and fields.

C: [VP Day] We live in an age where this is tricky business. I was considering a way to have CDO Kathy Wong(Lau) take a look at potential committee members with an eye towards diversity and make a recommendation.

A: I recommend that the committee find a way of including Kathy's perspective on diversity, equity, and inclusion. [McKee] When Theresa and I were meeting I asked her what policy she was following and how the names came up. We do not have a university policy governing who we might recommend to be on the committee. I checked and some CSU's have a policy and some don't. This is something we might want to consider in the future.

C: [Past Chair Mathur] I sat on this committee when I was Vice Chair of the Senate. When we got the recommended nominee names, we did our due diligence in researching them to see if there was anything in their background that could potentially reflect badly on SJSU and to ensure that they represented the values and the mission of the university. So, there is some investigative work that is done around each nominee, but I also hear VP Day's point. We should think about our diversity initiatives and who would best represent our university; faculty, staff and students.

[Beth Colbert] I had my research team put together a background document on the nominees that we are putting forward for consideration, specifically looking for any kind of a red flag or something in their background that could dissuade us from wanting to give them an honorary degree. Theresa and I have been having conversations about putting a specific process in place. There have been occasions that we have been given only two days to prepare nominations for the chancellor's office. We want to be out in front of it. We have a running list of people nominated by the colleges throughout the year and we go through it and look at who rises to the level where an honorary degree would be warranted and those are the names we put forward. We do have an eye on diversity such as in ensuring women and people of color are represented. We are happy to entertain nominees so if faculty have alumni that are distinguished in their career send me an email and we will add them to the list.

[VP Day] We should probably shore up how this list gets developed going forward. What Kathy provides us is the nuance of how things are shifting and how things move over time around these kinds of conversations. That is why I think Kathy can track that lens as to where things are going. I just wanted to make this clear as to why I was recommending Kathy Wong(Lau).

A: Thank you for that VP Day.

C: [CDO Wong(Lau)] I see a noticeable absence of anyone that is Latinx or someone that could look at those candidates for the honorary degree. If we are going to add people, we should look at that.

Q: Do you have a recommendation for someone to fill that role?

A: [CDO Wong(Lau)] CDO Wong(Lau) made several recommendations. The committee discussed and selected one of the recommendations to represent Latinx.

C: VP Davis announced that if there were no objections to the list as amended, she would be forwarding it to the president. There were no objections.

3. The Executive Committee discussed two nominees for one seat on the Athletics Board. The committee selected a nominee to recommend to the president (14-0-0).
4. The Executive Committee discussed the University Governance Awards and the President's Governance Award. The president's office contacted the Senate Administrator and asked for finalist recommendations for the President's Governance Award. The Senate Administrator provided the Executive Committee with a list of the students that were granted the University Governance Award for 2020-2021. Students are eligible for the University Governance Award if they have attended 80% of the meetings of either the Senate, a Senate Committee, the AS Board of Directors, or other AS Committee and are recommended by the committee chair. The Senate Administrator then submits student awardees to the Registrar's Office to have their transcript annotated with the award each year.

The President's University Governance Award does not have specific criteria and/or procedures for the award. The Executive Committee did not feel they could make a recommendation for the award to the president without further information about the students to make a selection. A suggestion was made that statements be collected from the students about what they had learned while serving on their committees along with recommendations from the committee chairs next year. The Executive Committee discussed procedures and it was felt that this should be handled out of the President's Office since the President selects the award winner for the year. Chair McKee will inform the president's office that the Executive Committee was not comfortable recommending finalists at this time

3 S6entD0.7 (i)-0(80.7 ()0.7 (deTJ-29.183 (f)]12(ear)-6.3 (.a6 (t)-11.-6 (ol)-0 (l)-0.7 ((f)]T33.7r)-6.3 (t)-11. (ent)-1a6 ((t)-11.3 es)-6 (i)-0.6 (d)-14.3 (d)-16.7 (ent)-1((t)-11.0.7 (at)-11.37)0.6 lea6.7Cromee fe7 (us)-6 (si)-0.6:11.4e w tas

- b. From the Professional Standards Committee (PS):
The PS Committee is still working on amendments to the Retention-Tenure-Promotion (RTP) policy, particularly looking at the service section with an eye on educational equity and inclusion. In addition, we are looking at having amendments to both the Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA) and academic assignment areas early in 2022.

PS is working with Maggie Barrera on creating a website that will contain all the information for departments that want to generate their own RTP guidelines. Right now it's a bit like being on a treasure hunt. We are trying to get this in a one-stop-shop where departments can get all the information they need to first of all make a decision on whether or not they need department guidelines and then
(Rr

b.

A: I haven't seen that data.

Q: