

2022-2023 Academic Senate Minutes
October 10, 2022

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Fifty-three Senators were present.

Ex Officio: Present: Van Selst, Curry, Rodan, Chuang, McKee Absent: None	CHHS Representatives: Present: Sen, Smith, Chang, Baur Absent: None
Administrative Representatives: Present: Perez, Wong(Lau), Faas, Day Absent: Del Casino	COB Representatives: Present: Tian, Chen Absent: None
Deans / AVPs: Present: Ehrman, Kaufman, Meth, d'Alarcao Absent: None	COED Representatives: Present: Mathur, Muñoz-Muñoz Absent: None
Students: Present: Chadwick, Saif, Treseler, Rapanot, Herrlin, Sheta Absent: None	ENGR Representatives: Present: Kao, Wong, Sullivan-Green Absent: None
Alumni Representative: Absent: Vacant	H&A Representatives: Present: Khan, Frazier, Kataoka, Lee, Riley, Han Absent: None
Emeritus Representative: Present: Jochim	COS Representatives: Present: French, Andreopoulos, Muller Absent: Shaffer
Honorary Representatives: Present: Peter, Buzanski Absent: Lessow-Hurley	COSS Representatives: Present: Sasikumar, Haverfield, Pinnell, Hart, Raman, Gomez Absent: None
General Unit Representatives: Present: Monday, Higgins, Masegian, Flandez, Lee Absent: None	

II. Land Acknowledgement: Senator Chuang presented the Land Acknowledgement.

III. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–
 The Senate Minutes of September 12, 2022 were approved (40-2-5).

IV. Communications and Questions –
A. From the Chair of the Senate:

The California state legislature passed AB 928 in October 2021 to require a single lower division general education pathway in the community colleges, CSU, and UC. This is now a matter of law. The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senate (ICAS) Cal GETC was formed to create a plan for the new GE Pathway. ICAS Cal GETC has released a proposal for a new GE

pathway to meet AB 928. It is important to note that a decision on Cal GETC is not a decision about CSU GE breadth requirements. They are related but separate issues. The local CSU campus Senate Chairs have been charged to submit feedback about their Senates' views that ultimately takes one of the following three positions regarding the ICAS Cal GETC proposal: a) support the June 2022 ICAS Cal GETC proposal; b) recommend specific changes that satisfy the requirements of AB 928 with rationale; c) unable to come to consensus. There is a very fast turnaround time.

There is some question about whether the CSU will retain the current CSU GE package for first-year students. I'm going to quote Sylvia Alvarez, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs: "I'd like to take this opportunity to reassure you as Senate leaders and faculty that this question has by no means been decided by the chancellor's office and instead, it will be the topic of important discussions to come. We share a strong commitment to shared governance and so we must work together to figure this whole thing out about adopting a singular lower division GE pattern and discuss and develop ways to ensure that all students have clear and streamlined ways to navigate GE requirements and have the support they need to receive."

I want to remind everyone that this is a representative body and it is an Academic Senate and not a "Faculty Senate." We do include faculty but we also include students, faculty, and administrators. I would urge you to consult with your constituents as much as you can given the short turnaround time.

Questions:

C: I've been very involved with various aspects of this proposal and a number of members of the ASCSU Executive Committee have been visiting areas across California to talk about or clarify by answering questions.

Q: In the groups that you are familiar with, what is the thinking about the efficacy of these campus polls and if they will have any effect whatsoever on the ASCSU's proposal?

A: [Senator Van Selst] I think that the room for movement is unlikely to be in the entire package. I think there is room for definitions of elements within each of the categories. I think that is still somewhat open. The Cal line is constrained because if the community colleges, CSU Senate's, and UC don't act by May, the system administration will determine what that transfer package will look like. We know that there would be a change in standard if that occurred, so we are really trying to make sure that we are doing due diligence in coming up with a path that is going to work for our students, the community colleges, and the UC.

C: For some reason they are trying to make clear the separation of a decision about Cal GETC from any changes to CSU GE breadth. Certainly, Cal GETC will affect all of those students at community colleges but as such, it is not a change to CSU GE.

B. From the President:

I encourage senators to speak up about the Cal GETC proposal.

The Department of Justice (DOJ) is visiting campus this week and also holding some open office hours.

We have had a number of events recently. We had our Parent and Family Weekend this past weekend. We also had several hundred students attend a welcome event and lunch on the Tower Lawn.

A few weeks ago, I had the opportunity to introduce Daymond John at the SJSU Insight Speaker's Series. He spoke to our students about entrepreneurship. Tomorrow we've got the opportunity to hear from a true legend, Doris Whitman.

Questions:

Q: Is it feasible for the university to share a little more information than what is required by law on the DOJ investigation?

A: We are doing the best we can to share information. The campus website has a link to the investigation and it has a host of information that has been going out to the campus. If there is something people are wondering about that we haven't shared information about, I'm happy to answer any questions. The difficulty is not knowing what people are interested in.

Q: Is there any update on how the CSU is going to address and respond to the recommendations in the staff salary study? In the meantime, are we doing anything to address job reclassifications in particular?

A: Absolutely. The CSU system in conjunction with the union contracted out to have a staff salary study done to look at the level of our salaries, the structure of our salaries, and what our job classifications look like. The review came back in mid-spring and the results were not surprising that our staff are underpaid relative to market. We lobbied hard in the spring to try and get funds this fiscal year to address some of the challenges, but were not successful in getting it. At the last Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting, there was a conversation about what our budget request will be from the BOT to the state of California, and there is a request for another \$200 million included to address staff and faculty salaries to some extent. There are also processes for reclassifications, so if you have staff in that situation, a request for reclassification should come from their manager.

Q: Many faculty are discussing the shooting of faculty at the University of Arizona. What can faculty do to prevent the same thing from happening here?

A: It is a tragic situation. We face similar issues as other campuses. I know our University Police Department (UPD) is very concerned about this as well. I'd be happy to meet and discuss the best way to protect any individual or group.

Q: My question relates to Peter Lim's presentation to the Senate. He said he was employed by Cozen-O'Connor, but works for us. Which organization does his salary come from and who does his evaluation?

A: Last fall the CSU system hired Cozen-O'Connor to evaluate Title IX across campuses. Peter Lim was assigned to us by Cozen-O'Connor as a Deputy Title IX Officer. We pay Cozen-O'Connor and they pay Peter Lim.

Q: How do we evaluate his performance if he doesn't work for us? Couldn't this be a conflict of interest?

A: If we don't think he is doing a good job for us, we can fire him. There is no conflict of interest.

Q: Given that we aren't sure who is evaluating his performance, how we be sure of this?

A: [VP Faas] We aren't allowed to do his evaluation if he is a contractor. We can't do evaluations on any of our contractors.

V. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

Executive Committee Minutes of August 29, 2022—No questions

Executive Committee Minutes of September 19, 2022—

Q: The Executive Committee Minutes of September 19, 2022 refer to some misinformation on the ASCSU website. Can you elaborate on what that was?

A: [Senator Curry] It was in relation to AB 928. It was the call for the feedback which we gave in the Spring. There was misinformation about what feedback and there was confusion about where we were. It had been left up so it needed to be changed.

B. Consent Calendar:

AVC Katoaka presented the Consent Calendar of October 10, 2022.

Senator Haverfield explained that in accordance with University Policy S22-5, Resolved clause #6, the Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) is authorized to recommend changes to the GE Guidelines. C&R is recommending the "Proposed Modifications to the Assessment Section of 2022 GE Guidelines" that are included with the Senate packet. Changes were made based on feedback from Department Chairs and Coordinators, specifically addressing streamlining procedures of the Program Planning Report by removing assessment summaries for each course and instead referring to assessment activities of the department. C&R deemed the

revisions to the GE Guidelines as minor. Senator Peter explained that the Consent Calendar is a package of items for the Senate to adopt without debate. If a single person dissents to any part of the Consent Calendar then that gets pulled and then is debated later on in the agenda. The Consent Calendar is usually used for non-controversial changes and committee appointments. There was no dissent to the Consent Calendar with the GE Guideline modifications.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

VI. Unfinished Business: None

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

A. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):

AS 1832, Senate Management Resolution, Update of the Standing Rules of the Academic Senate (First Reading).

This resolution proposes changing Standing Rule 17g, which lays out expectations for meeting modality. This standing rule proposes changes to the Senate meetings, Executive Committee meetings, Policy Committee meetings, and all other meetings. This resolution proposes that each group will vote on the modality each year with three modality options on the ballot: in person, hybrid, and online meetings. O&G recommends the voting happen shortly after the first May meeting of the new Senate.

Questions:

Q: If the Senate one semester votes to have hybrid meetings, will the university commit to giving the Senate a room of the appropriate size and with the appropriate equipment in it to conduct the meetings? It is my understanding that the rooms listed are not available or aren't large enough. It seems to me that if this is a priority the university ought to do what is required to secure a room with the appropriate equipment and support for the Senate that would be workable in a hybrid environment. Has O&G discussed this with the Interim President Perez and been able to get a commitment to provide this support?

A: This was discussed in the Executive Committee, but I don't believe there was a definite answer in the committee. I would like to note that O&G believes there are a lot of interesting options. There are some rooms listed in the resolutions and others in the Student Union. Another option is to acquire some equipment such as microphones that could be placed on the tables. An existing room could be outfitted to run our meetings.

Q: My question pertains to the Senate and Executive Committee meetings. In the past two years that we've been in Zoom meetings, was our Senate and our Executive Committee more diverse? Are new

Senators more active now than they were before remote attendance? If not, where did O&G get its rationale?

A: O&G has researched studies on meeting modality. Some of the research was on government meetings at local levels comparing and contrasting modalities. That research was mostly comparing the pros and cons of online and in-person modalities. The findings of that research align very closely with what Senators shared at last year's Senate Retreat, where we just looked at two modalities online and in person. They have pros and cons. That is part of the reason that O&G after much deliberation included hybrid as an option. We as a body, as a Senate, have not given much consideration to hybrid. In some ways, hybrid seems like a workable compromise. However, O&G is not suggesting any modality. We are saying that choice should be made by Senators in each cohort based on which meeting is most beneficial to them.

Q: Thank you and O&G for considering this. I've already expressed my concerns, especially about Senate and Executive Committee meetings and mentorship and leadership capacity building as well as operational issues. I do have a few questions. Has O&G brought in the people that actually run the Senate and Executive Committee meetings? Particularly, has O&G discussed this with the Senate Chair and Senate Administrator, both of whom are deeply involved and have a deep understanding of the logistics, the Senate budget, and the actual operations of the meetings? This is not just for reasons of consultation, but also for building relationships with our staff, in this case, our Senate Administrator. This moves us away from top-down decision-making where our staff specifically lack visibility and input. My second question is has O&G discussed and done research on specific issues for the different meeting modalities such as engagement, multitasking, and focus? My third question is has O&G discussed what would happen to committee membership if the committee does not decide before the semester starts and decides to meet in person, for example?

A: [Chair McKee] Please email those questions to Senator Hart so we can get a few more questions in here.

C: CFA is doing a hybrid meeting tomorrow and we are going to try this out. We will have two wireless microphones and 1 wired microphone. We had problems finding a room. We did finally get a room in the Student Union, but that was after two weeks of consultation with the Event Center.

C: Has there been any research on student engagement in this hybrid modality? I would just like to ask people to keep students in mind when working on this resolution.

B. University Library Board (ULB): No report.

C. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):

Senator Sullivan-Green presented ***AS 1835, Amendment B to University Policy F20-1, Adding Classes After Advance Registration (Final Reading)***. Senator Van Selst presented a motion to add a new whereas clause to read, “The implementation of waitlists for intersession sessions are generally shorter than the full seven business days listed in this policy for regular fall/spring semesters, therefore be it.” The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the Van Selst motion passed (17-15-13). The Senate discussed issues with the Van Selst amendment. Senator Sullivan-Green noted that the policy itself, F20-1, does have language that says that the waitlist will remain active only for the advance registration period. That makes this amendment redundant and creates more confusion. **Senator Van Selst presented a motion to return to committee with instruction to address the intersession issue. The motion was seconded by Senator Flandez. The Senate voted and the motion passed (31-3-8).**

D. Professional Standards Committee (PS): Report moved to next meeting.

E. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):

Senator Haverfield presented ***AS 1836, Amendment A to University Policy S16-17, Academic Certificate Program, Review and Approval Process (First Reading)***. The objective of this amendment is to update language in the policy, reflect current infrastructure, address staffing of certificates, course requirements, timelines to complete certificates, and correct an error in the description of grade averaging. Note that this policy includes both basic and advanced certificates both of which are included in the revisions. In addition to updating institutional terms, under the section titled, “Specific Academic Basic Certificate Programs,” item 5 allows completion of the certificate through open university under specific conditions, such as a bachelor’s degree and that the department approved. Item 6 allows use of courses from a certificate program in a major or minor degree course’s requirement. Under the heading specific “Academic Advanced Certificate Programs,” item 2 now indicates that at least 3 units of 200 level or higher course work is required. Item 4 limits double counting of coursework between 2 certificates up to 3 units. Item 5b corrects language to be consistent with university policy and that policy is F08-2. Item 5c addresses open university in the context of Advanced Certificates. Finally, item 9 defines the expiration of certificate courses to align with master’s degree course expectation.

Questions:

Q: I've been waiting for this to come to the Senate floor to bring up some concerns we have in the School of Social Work. The certificate requires courses that are graded. They can't take credit/no credit courses. Would the committee reconsider this? There are several certificate programs we would like to offer but can't, because they use credit/no credit courses.

A: Thank you. I will take this back to the committee.

Q: I have a question about 5a and 5b and the consequences of those. If a student fails a course or gets an "F" or "WU," then repeats the course and gets a "D+," the requirement seems to be that there is not grade forgiveness but grade averaging. That grade averaging will be less than a "D" so the student cannot use that course for their degree. Do I understand the implication of that correctly?

A: My understanding is that they must maintain a 3.0 across all courses.

Q: I'm talking about an individual course, so if I take a course and I get a "0" and then I take it again and I get a "B," which is a 3.0, the course average is a 1.5, so that says a 2.0 average. Therefore, I cannot use that course? This means that I would have to get an "A" to bring the average up to a 3.0 in order for the course to count. I don't believe that was the intent. I think that grade forgiveness is probably what was intended for graduate course work. I see a potential trap that we need to make sure we aren't setting.

A: I see your point, but grade averaging is across all courses taken within the certificate program. I will bring this back to committee for clarification.

Q: Can you tell me why there were several people that abstained from voting on your committee?

A: These people were not present for voting.

C: For future reference, the abstain vote is for people that actually abstain and not people that are absent. The absent people would not be included in the count at all.

VIII. Special Committee Reports:

CSU Course Equity report to the Senate by Heidi Riggio, Professor of Psychology, Senator, Academic Senate CSU Los Angeles and Steve Rein, Professor of Statistics, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo

Today we're going to talk with you about a tool that has been developed by the Chancellor's Office called the Course Equity Portal. I am part of the team as well as Professor Rein and Professor Monica Kress from SJSU. The mission of the CSU is to educate Californians, especially those with lower access to higher education and students that have less social and financial power. There are equity gaps in the CSU. There are students that are

members of historically marginalized, oppressed, and exploited groups and so-called underrepresented minority groups. First generation and Pell Grant students receive more DFW and non-credit and “C” grades than students that are not members of these historically oppressed, marginalized, and exploited groups, and who are not first generation and Pell Grant recipients.

The Course Equity Portal (CEP) tools provide information to the faculty member that may not exist in the courses that they teach. It is 100% confidential data and is accessible only by you. Finding an equity gap does not mean the person is doing something wrong. Equity gaps are affected by K-12 education, poverty, and many other factors. Knowing about these gaps helps us address them in our courses and create the most equitable learning environment for all of our students. The CEP team is here today to ask you to help us evaluate and improve the equity portal by providing us feedback on the ease of the use of the portal and its usefulness to you. You will be given access to the portal. There is a pre-survey and then most importantly the evaluation of the course equity portal. We are not going to be publishing data and nobody will be identified. We are using this data to improve the usefulness of the portal. We want faculty to use this tool obviously to eliminate equity gaps. If you have any problems with the survey, please email me and my email is at the beginning of the survey.

Questions:

Q: You mentioned the gap will only be visible to the faculty members themselves. Is this new, because my understanding is that in the past the chair of the department could see this information? Can you give a rationale for that because I can see in some cases where having more content would actually be better? It might be useful for the faculty member to see the gap isn't related to the faculty member. Why is it important that nobody else sees the information?

A: [Heidi Riggio] Nobody will have access to the information provided by the portal tool. However, campuses do have research departments and may have access to portals that provide this kind of course information, but this portal is 100% confidential. All information using the CEP tool is only visible to the individual faculty member. As for your second question that it could be useful to compare your course's equity gap with other sections, that kind of finding is reported in the course equity portal. Your section will be compared to all other sections of the course. For example, if there is a gap, that will be reported to you. Sometimes classes are too small or only one person teaches the course, so it is harder to do comparisons or do a report. In this case there may not be any comparative information or there won't be any finding of gaps. We do provide comparative information based on courses that are offered.

A: [Steve Rein] You should be able to download the data in some format and we hope to expand over time to give even greater flexibility for you to make your own comparisons. If it is reported anywhere in the portal you should be

able to download the data that's in that report. This would allow you to compare your courses with others who are teaching comparable courses.

A: [Monica Cardoza, Special Consultant to the Chancellor's Office] When we do the comparisons to other sections of the same course we only do it if five sections are there. We don't do it for a smaller number because the whole point is that this is confidential to you. The other thing is if you are making a comparison of a 200-level course, we will compare you to other 200 level courses in the department.

Q: My question is in the RTP process, is it appropriate for me to go in and voluntarily include this information?

A: [Heidi Riggio] Yes, you can. It is your information to use as you want, but no one can make you include that in your RTP file. The department chair would have no access, and committees would have no access.

Q: What if I decided not to access information on my courses, can someone tell I didn't?

A: [Heidi Riggio] No. We don't know who accesses their data or not. It is voluntary for you to use to improve your teaching. Then we offer resources for faculty development.

Q: If I log in and see I have a huge DFW gap in my class, what then? What supports are built into this? What kind of ways can I be encouraged?

A: [Heidi Riggio] We do include suggestions of resources and as we are working on the portal we are adding more and more resources.

Q: What if there are two very large first semester physics classes for engineers with 200 people in each and if the two faculty members don't get notified then how would one know if they were way off as far as DFW gap from the other? That seems like a missed opportunity.

A: [Heidi Riggio] That is a good point, but we are trying to protect people's confidentiality. If we report to professor A that they have a lower DFW rate, then professor B is going to know who professor A is. I understand the missed opportunity. However, it has to be completely confidential or faculty won't use it and we can't use the data to help address equity gaps in the CSU as a whole.

Q: Five or 10 years we had someone from the chancellor's office come to a Senate Retreat and teach us how to look at DFW rates. I was able to look at all the DFW rates for all of the classes in my department. It was actually quite informative. I saw some patterns. Classes that had a lot of reading and writing had high DFW rates and those that didn't had lower DFW rates. This sounds like a different tool than what you are talking about. Is it?

A: [Heidi Riggio] That's correct. That's the student success dashboard that anybody can access right now. The CEP focuses specifically on each course

the person teaches and not the broad statistics you can find on the student success dashboard. It is a different tool.

C: That sounds like a lot of the material you are working so hard to keep confidential, which I think is appropriate. This other information is just out there on this other tool.

A: [Heidi Riggio] Yes, unfortunately some campuses have their own campus-based tools they have developed. If you did some investigating you could probably figure out who is Professor X with the odd DFW rate right. However, the CEP is limited only to your own courses and is confidential for to you. If you were an investigative reporter you could probably find out a lot from the student success dashboard but not from this tool.

IX. New Business:

Senator Curry presented a motion to suspend Standing Rule 7b, the order of the agenda, to move ***AS 1837, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Support and Solidarity with Iranian Women and solidarity with Iranian Women and University Communities Manifested in “Woman-Life-Freedom” (Final Reading)*** to before the Policy Committee Reports in the agenda. The motion was seconded. **The Senate voted and the Curry motion passed (38-2-8). Senator Van Selst presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change, “Woman-Life-Freedom” to “Woman, Life, Freedom” wherever it appears in the resolution.** Senator Faas presented an amendment to add a Resolved clause #3 to read, “Resolved: that we ask the governor to not allow use of state funds for official travel to Iran. The motion was seconded by Senator Rodan. The Senate voted and the motion failed (7-30-8). **Senator Frazier presented a motion to move the previous question. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the motion passed (43-2-1). The Senate voted and AS 1837 passed as amended (40-0-3).**

X. State of the University Announcements:

A. Associated Students President (AS):

AS President Chuang announced *Happy Indigenous People’s Day and Happy Legacy Month.*

We recently had new student and parent weekend.

The Student Trustee search has begun. AS President Chuang is part of that committee. If you know any students that are interested in serving on the BOT please let her know.

There are a number of events scheduled for Homecoming and Legacy month.

Fire in the Fountain will be held on October 27, 2022.

AS President Chuang recently spoke at the Transit Month Celebration.

AS is still recruiting for student seats on Senate committees.

AS President Chuang invited all Senators to attend a picnic with the AS President on October 28, from 1-3 p.m. in front of the AS House.

Questions:

Q: When you say picnic does it involve food?

A: Of course!

C: Please add me to the list.

Q: [From AS President Chuang to reflect on] How can we as Senators use our positions to elevate the student voice and be representatives of our community?

B. Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF): Not present.

C. Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA):

We had a wonderful family weekend with 1,200 people in attendance. This is a group of highly engaged students and families. It is important for us to have these opportunities for engagement.

We are at 98% of our target enrollment. There are significant enrollment declines across the state. We are very pleased our students have come back at the higher rate. Our housing occupancy remains high. It is at 94%. Students are very interested in making sure they have an opportunity to live on campus. There were 135 programs in the Weeks of Welcome, 92 were in person, 34 were online, and 9 were hybrid.

Our Spartan Speaker series has been mentioned a number of times. It is hybrid so you can join online. You need to get tickets to come in person.

You've probably heard about SB 24. This is about the distribution of abortion medication on college campuses. We will be providing that for our students.

AB 367 concerns menstrual equity for all. We are in the staging process. We are investigating what works in terms of where we will locate different types of products. They will be in men's and women's restrooms.

We will be getting an \$8 million grant from the federal government for student internship-like opportunities to work with faculty on their research. This is being coordinated out of our career center.

Senator Sasikumar presented a motion to extend the meeting until 5:07 p.m. The motion was seconded. The motion was friendly to the body.

Questions:

Q: What is the proposed timeline for AB 367?

A: AB 367 is already happening. SB 24 will be fully in place in January.

Q: I'd like to ask you about Governor Newsom's new program College Corp. SJSU is one of the universities participating in this. Can you tell us a little bit about this? What kind of work are they doing? How much money do they get per year?

A: This is not coming up through my area. I believe it is part of Community Learning and Leadership. I don't have those specific answers, but it looks like the president does.

A: [Interim President Perez] I have some of the answers. We have 94 students participating. I believe we have the largest number of students in the system participating. They can get up to \$10,000 for doing some type of community work associated with our region.

D. Chief Diversity Officer: Moved to Next Meeting.

E. CSU Faculty Trustee: Moved to Next Meeting.

F. Statewide Academic Senators: Moved to Next Meeting.

G. Provost: Moved to Next Meeting.

XI. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.