

2023-2024 Academic Senate Minutes
October 02, 2023

I. Call to Order and Roll Call:

The meeting was called to order at 2:02 p.m. Forty-six senators were present.

Ex Officio: Present: Curry, Mckee, Multani, Rodan, Sasikumar, Van Seltst	CHHS Representatives: Present: Baur, Chang, Sen
Administrative Representatives: Present: Day, Del Casino, Faas, Lee, Teniente-Matson	COB Representatives: Present: Chen
Deans/AVPS: Present: D'Alarcao, Meth Absent: Kaufman, Shillington	COED Representatives: Present: Mathur Absent: Muñoz-Muñoz
Students: Present: Brown, Gambarin, Guzman, Lacson, Mejia, Tikawala	ENGR Representatives: Present: Kao, Sullivan-Green, Wong
Alumni Representative: Absent: <i>Vacant</i>	H&A Representatives: Present: Buyco, Frazier, Katoka, Absent: Han, Lee
Emeritus Representative: Present: Jochim	COS Representatives: Present: French, Heindl, Shaffer Absent: Muller
Honorary Representatives: Present: Lessow-Hurley, Peter Absent: Buzanski	COSS Representatives: Present: Hart, Haverfield, Pinnell, Raman, Sabalius
General Unit Representatives: Present: Johnson, Masegian, Pendyala, Absent: Flandez, Velarde	

II. Land Acknowledgement: Senator Hart read the history of the land acknowledgment and Senator Reiko presented the land acknowledgment.

III. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

The Senate Minutes of the last meeting of 2022-2023, May 8th were approved (20-0-10). The Senate Minutes of the first meeting of 2023-2024 were approved 26-0-8.

The Senate Minutes of September 11, 2023, were approved as amended 29-0-5.

IV. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Sasikumar acknowledged today is Gandhi's birthday and so the United Nations declared today to be the international day of non-violence. She thanked everyone for taking the time from their labs, classrooms, offices, and families to attend today's meeting, thus contributing to a culture of deliberation and non-violence.

Chair Saskiumar welcomed our two newest senators, Senators Romey Sabalius and Raymand Buyco. Senator Sabalius is joining us in a new role, he is now the senator from the College of Humanities and the Arts. Senator Buyco, who many know as the president of the faculty union, is representing the College of Social Sciences for the semester. Our colleague, Senator Marco Meniketti is on sabbatical.

Chair Sasikumar introduced her student assistant, Maharsh Soni. He is a master's student here at SJSU studying data Analytics. He has made himself invaluable to us.

Chair Sasikumar reminded everyone that the meeting is being recorded on Zoom for the purpose of the minutes. It will be destroyed once those are done. Chair Sasikumar asked all the Senators to please sign the roll call sheets at the back of the room. She let everyone know we were still only using one mic and if for any reason someone did not feel comfortable standing up to please raise their hand and the mic would be brought to them.

Chair Sasikumar let everyone know we have made progress in constituting the Special Committee on Senate representation based on the SMR passed at the last meeting.

Chair Sasikumar let everyone know that Senator administrator, Eva Joice is well enough to return to work. She is in her office on the fifth floor of Clark Hall. Unfortunately under doctors' orders, she cannot leave her cubicle.

Chair Sasikumar reminded everyone that the next meeting will not be in the normal ENG venue. It will be in the library room 225 and it will only be two hours long so it will finish at 4 pm. The meeting is on October 16 and will feature a budget presentation from CFO Charlie Fass as well as a presentation from Provost Vincent Del Casino and Vice-Provost Magdalena Barrera on Academic Affairs.

Chair Sasikumar reminded everyone of the calls for nominations for the Wang Family Excellence Awards and the Faculty Awards. There are four faculty awards, Outstanding Lecturer, Outstanding Professor, Distinguished Service, and President's Scholar Award.

Chair Sasikumar reminded Senators there is a time certain presentation of 3:15 pm. on AB 928, ICAS & CAL-GETC: Implications for SJSU's GE Program. We will all be affected by the changes in GE that were triggered by legislative action. The Senate has the responsibility of collecting the views on the campus and we are working with the deadline of exactly one month. Please take this opportunity to ask questions and please go back to your constituency and talk to your colleagues about these changes. Have them send their views and report back to us using a survey that will be shared. This is the quickest and most efficient way to guarantee academic input on intercurricular issues.

Chair Sasikumar welcomed Senator and President Cynthia Teniente-Matson.

B. From the President of the University:

President Teniente-Matson invited and welcomed Lisa Millora to the front of the room to provide an update on the Title IX progress as well as respond to a question that was presented to her at the last Senate meeting.

Lisa Millora thanked the Senate for allowing her to join today's meeting. She shared that the US Department of Justice will be coming to campus in late October as part of their regular monitoring. All those who are not familiar with the US Department of Justice resolution agreement can visit the Title IX website and select the section called compliance which stores all the reports and timeline.

Lisa Millora thanked Senator Curry and Senator McKee for providing Title IX with groups and feedback last year. Based on their feedback a graphic was produced.

Lisa Millora explained that as part of the Department of Justice's resolution agreement, they will be working with us for the next four years. One year is completed, this is year two so there are two more years left. They will be here in October to do a series of meetings with faculty, staff, and students to try to understand how we are meeting the parents to the resolution agreement. Those who would like to meet with them can meet during business hours or outside of standard hours. Meetings are scheduled between October 16 and 19.

Lisa Millora provided an update on the search for a permanent Title IX coordinator, which is now a search for an Associate Vice President for Title IX and Equal Opportunity. She provided background on how the decision to combine both roles was made. We have engaged with a search firm, WittKieffer which has a master agreement with the system. The timeline we hope to meet is interviewing semifinalists in November with campus business taking place in the last week of November. Ideally, make an offer and have the person in the role by January.

Lisa Millora spoke about a previously asked question about the conduct of concern which is a language that was in one of the reports. One of the things that came up in the Cozen O'Connor review of the entire system administration of Title IX and discrimination, harassment, and retaliation is that there are reports made about behavior that does not rise to the level of policy violation. Going back to the alignment of Title IX and DHR under one roof will allow for better responsiveness to the conduct of other concerns.

Questions:

Q: Is the title still associate vice president? That seems to insinuate that the person will report to a vice president. Is that desirable for Title IX officers? From the Title IX officer, not be reporting to anybody but the president directly.

A: Part of it is based on the California State University's expectation that the reporting line is 3 vice presidents. Another way to think about it is to report to the president through a vice president. The President and I have talked through how to ensure she's kept apprised of information without being involved to allow the process to move forward fairly and neutrally.

President Teniente-Matson stated she wanted to share a couple of items that came from the trustees' meeting that are relevant to Title IX. There is a new memorandum from the Chancellor that asks that the Chancellor's Office and the Chancellor be notified of any conduct that involves the president, the vice presidents, the athletic director, and the chief of police. The second part of the memorandum is that the Chancellor would be advised immediately of any sexual violence acts that occur on our campus. One additional item from the trustees' meeting is that the chair of the board herself has requested that at each meeting an update on Title IX activities at the campus level be given so that there is a continual loop with the trustees as well in terms of accountability.

President Teniente-Matson informed the senate that the trustees approved a 6% tuition increase effective next fall. She and AS President Multani have been

meeting on this and will be activating some tabling events to talk with students specifically about their unmet needs or concerns as we move forward into the fall of 2024. She is working with our new AVP Julie Nagai on the creation of additional scholarship dollars that would be available to students who may have unmet needs.

President Teniente-Matson thanked all individuals who participated in the Budget Summit. Vice President Faas will cover some of the next steps in his report. She is delighted with the work that was presented and the video presentations from members of the Budget Advisory Committee. Based on the feedback Vice President Faas will present some revenue projections back to the BAC. She has asked him to drop 3 scenarios and take them back to BAC for enrollment targets.

President Teniente-Matson spoke about free speech on campus and some videos that were done by several campus leaders. As many are aware there will be some potentially controversial speakers on campus and appropriate measures to preserve the maximum protection of free speech and assembly have been taken. She encourages all to look at the websites, check out the videos, and pass them along to your student communities and faculty communities.

President Teniente-Matson reminded all that October 16th is the same day as the Senate meeting which has a focus on budget, will be the legacy date of action. On this day, at noon we will be celebrating on the Smith and Carlos Lawn. She invited all to participate.

President Teniente-Matson shared updates on two meetings that she held. One was with the Black Spartan advisory group for the council regarding the Black Student Success Report. She took their input with assistance from Dawn Lee, our interim Chief Diversity Officer on not only the findings of the report but also on the steps that we may move forward in. She also met with the Athletics Board which gave her an opportunity to talk to them about their charge for this particular year.

Questions

Q: What is the charge to the Athletics Board? In regards to your last comment, could you say a little more?

A: What I talked to the Athletics Board about is the Senate policy on which they are governed. I asked them to review the charge and determine if it was still relevant.

Q: You mentioned a revised charge. Will this have anything to do with financial sustainability?

A: I think there is a nexus between the work being done with the Budget Advisory Committee and some of the recommendations that include athletics fundraising and reliance on the general fund. I am asking them to also have this conversation as we look at sports sponsorship as well as the options that are out for our conference realignment and how we remain competitive in that space.

Q: For the event today, I looked at the flyers and what they have posted on Instagram, and very clearly they seem to be using our name, San Jose State University, in their promotion materials. Is there a way moving forward to kind of consider how those events are marketed and to minimize the use of our name?

A: We have had a number of conversations about ensuring we have a safe event in terms of the marketing itself.

VP of Student Affairs Patrick Day: This event is sponsored by a recognized student organization on our campus of which there are 350. We have training around this, how the name is and is not supposed to be used relative to their student groups and there is also a CSU policy on this. The challenge is once you get to social media it gets further and further from the center. We do respond specifically when people have that question, we have shared this with members of our staff and incoming inquiries, making it very clear that this is an event sponsored by one of our recognized student organizations.

Q: We are in tight budgetary times which means that across the academic colleges, some really tough decisions and discussions are happening. I have heard from colleagues that there are potential suspensions or degree/program terminations that are happening. Can you talk about this?

A: We're going to defer to the pros and we can bring this back to a future meeting for further conversation.

Provost Del Casino: To be clear, there are many different pathways to why a program may or may not be closed. I signed like half a dozen program suspensions or discontinuations in the past week that were all driven by local units. These were not driven by the dean or the provost's office but rather some come by external reviews or department conversations. The board reaffirmed the 1971 policy on program closure at the last meeting which in part suggests

that campuses need to look at their programs and they've set some metrics. They're going to let those campuses decide what to do with that data once they get it. Where a unit or department wants to be, drive those conversations and they have invited me in to offer my opinion but I am not driving that process as the provost.

V. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of Executive Committee:

Executive Committee Minutes of August 21, 2023 - No questions.

Executive Committee Minutes of August 28, 2023 - No questions.

Executive Committee Minutes of September 18, 2023

Questions:

Q: It was noted that NACADA is coming and they will be conducting a review on faculty advising, is this correct?

A: Yes, that is correct.

Q: Just faculty advising not the staff?

A: Yes that is correct because we've already done a staff analysis.

B. Consent Calendar

AVC Kataoka presented the Consent Calendar of October 2, 2023. There was no dissent to the consent calendar.

C. Executive Committee Action Items: None

VI. Unfinished Business: None

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

A. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

Senator French presented ***AS 1858, Amendment C to the University Policy S13-6 (Final Reading).***

The Senate voted and AS1858 passed unanimously.

Senator French presented ***AS 1859, Amendment A to University Policy F08-4 (Final Reading).***

The Senate voted and AS1859 unanimously passed.

VIII. Special Committee Reports:

Special Committee Report by Senators Curry and Wong on AB 928, ICAS & CAL-GETC: Implications for SJSU's GE Program.

Senator Curry & Wong acknowledge the fact it is the senators themselves who are experts in GE and have been active members in the Statewide Committee on General Education and the ASCSU Policy committees that address these issues, both in academic affairs and academic preparation programs. It is important to note that our Senate has had several discussions on AB 928, ICAS, and Cal-GETC. We have also gathered data regarding general education with our former chair Mathur and the former chair of Curriculum and Research. Dr. Wong and Senator Curry have had extensive meetings with the chair of the ASCSU, Dr. Beth Steffel, and the current chair of GEAC, Dr. Eniko Csomay therefore this report is on the training they have received as well as their participation and discussion on these issues.

The first slide is Terms and Acronyms which describes various terms that will be used throughout the report.

The second slide is about AB928. It is a law regarding the transfer program, not regarding CSUGE. This is the really important point that my colleague, Dr. Wong, and I [Senator Curry] want to deliver today. We will probably have changes to general education because it is kind of like bylaws and constitutions, they are living documents that need to be updated.

The third slide is in regard to the ICAS program, which was presented, and approved in June of 2023. There are documents you can find and the last slide of this presentation provides resources with live links. Regarding the comment Chair Sasikumar made about the narrow timeframe, it is not about CSU GE. The AB 928 & Cal-GETC already left, that is what the Board of Trustees will be deciding in either November or January but they are not deciding on our campus's general education program.

The next slide is to reiterate what we were told by Chair Steffel and Chair Csomay that we are no longer talking Statewide or with the Board of Trustees about the changes to GE. We need to think about the chatter and persistent lack of trust which is a persistent issue that dates to other elements but always has to do with shared governance.

The fifth slide is to reflect and act upon the implications of Cal-GETC. The CSU input process is much like the resolution we just approved, we discuss them, we vote on them, and then send them to the President to sign. In addition, they give Dr. Van Selst, Dr. Rodan, and myself information about what we deliver to the statewide senate which is why we really want to focus today. We were told we had time because we are not voting on campus GE so we have time to gather evidence through a survey. This survey is very short and very direct in terms of asking you what the chatter that you have heard regarding AB928. The next slide spoke more regarding this, asking the SJSU faculty to exercise their voice.

The next slide, CSU GE Breadth and the Transfer Curriculum Proposed by ICAS is being provided for informational purposes only. You will notice on the right is our CSU GE Breadth of 39 units and the other side is the Cal GETC with only 34 units which applies only to transfer students. It is very important that we recognize that they didn't just give us a pattern of courses, they provided very important guidelines and standards including grading. Cal-GETC requires a very different grading structure than what we use in our general education program. You will notice that areas E, C3, and the laboratory have changed. I believe that it is our responsibility to speak about what are the consequences of those changes. It is very important that you all speak up and think of general education as one of the most treasured areas in our curriculum. Why? Because it tells us what we believe students must have to be educated citizens to participate in our nation, campus, and state democracy.

The next slide contains some guiding questions. How does it affect our students in terms of admissions? How does it affect our students in terms of academic success in our conversations? In my long-term conversation with folks regarding the community college system, one of the things that we frequently hear is the poor advising at the community college level. Should we be accepting this poor advising at the community college level? What control do we have over that advising? We have control of what happens to our students here.

There are some very important points we want to address. To reiterate, we are professors but this is not about us, it is about what will be the impact on our students. What will the SJSU students encounter if we do not think ahead about informing the ASCSU and the Board of Trustees to take special consideration of the program that already has been passed which will affect Title 5? We are being told that there will be 2 pathways effectively. They are the frosh first-year pathway with 39 units and the CAL-GETC pathway with 34 units.

Slide 12 shows what we are doing today which is we are promoting a survey. We are promoting feedback from all of you because you are the only experts in this field. We want the campus to speak up loudly given our expertise. We have been leaders in providing information and in answering the call from ASCSU for feedback in their effort to address shared governance.

Dr. Wong and I are available to respond to this particular presentation on these issues. But we do have other experts, Dr. Rodan and Dr. Van Selst can also be approached. I wish to reiterate that we want feedback and informed examinations of how your programs fit versus the university's general education programs. We want to prepare a report that will go back to the ASCSU and through them to the Board of Trustees.

Questions, Comments, Feedback

C: Sharing from a perspective point of view of the Academic Affairs Committee. Not sure I share this optimism that this won't be on the board's agenda. For the last 2 years what we have been hearing from the Chancellor's office is that they would like to see an alignment of CSU-GE with CAL-GETC. The second thing we have been hearing is that they do not want to present to the Board of Trustees independent requests for Title 5 changes. This means that the work that was developing in CAL-GETC could be voted on by the Board of Trustees immediately. In fact, the Senate passed two resolutions one in May of last year and another in the September meeting, calling on the Board of Trustees to make a decision to adopt CAL-GETC curriculum for transfer students. My sense is that the Chancellor's Office wants to get this done as soon as possible. We are talking about CSU-GE, not CAL-GETC because that is a done deal. The question is should we align CSU-GE with CAL-GETC? The Chancellor's office wants to present this to the Board of Trustees as a single package.

C: The questions I have are slightly off-topic at this point but I present them to you as suggestions for further consideration and debate when you are talking to whoever is guiding this. The feedback of the questions posed by instructors who teach lifelong learning and e-courses is more of an informational need. They are writing to ask us what is the current guidance at SJSU regarding the future viability of area courses. As you proceed with this fact-finding mission, I hope you include our students because they would have some pretty valuable perspectives to share as well. The question is will the university incorporate life-long learning as university-required units? If you would like instructors and chairs to work on

making sure their existing courses are viable, what kind of support can they expect? This may need to get done quickly so it can effectively occur.

C: Going back to AB928 was believed to require alignment of CSU-GE and CAL-GETC. The law does not state this but that is not how it has been presented. The Chancellor's Office is full steam ahead on the belief it should be 1 path and 1 path only. The difficulty is that CAL-GETC requires students to be UC-eligible and that cuts off the number of students. Admissions does not require GE so I think moving forward when we look at the associate's degrees for transfers and those degrees are defined as narrowly as possible for your disciplines, that will determine what courses people will come in with.

The Trustees believe that it should be 1 path and 1 path only. When we look at the associate degrees for transfers, if it is narrow rather than broad you can guarantee what the students come in. When we look at implementation, it will be important to look within the major and see what associated career content is.

C: I do feel that it is going to be taken to the Board of Trustees at some point and it will be what the Chancellor's office would like it to be, which is exactly the same for frosh and transfers. Our CSU GE breadth will not be a discussion after that point. This also means that there will be the elimination of E, the extra C, and the integrated lab. There are other opportunities like that where we can determine around this system what we would like to have for our students here in SJSU outside of area G, meaning university requirements. We should all blow up the survey but we all have different perspectives and in the end, it will be what the Board of Trustees is likely to say. So we need to be prepared to not have CSU GE requirements.

Q: The call for the survey is very faculty-centric but there are other areas on this campus that aren't a part of Academic Affairs that will also be affected by this change. Are we [those outside the division] invited to respond to the survey as well?

A: Yes, we are asking senators and there is a section in the survey where you can say you are a student.

C: My suggestion based on what others have also stated is that this is a great opportunity to examine the first-year experience requirements.

Q: Based on what Senator Rodan talked about Title 5, the US Institutions, we have heard rumors about including that in any cuts.

A: American Institutions is actually outside of GE and it is not part of CAL-GETC or CSU-GE.

C: I want to go back to something Senator Mathur said which is to acknowledge the importance of us going back to whatever group we represent and are educating. I find that in different departments, even within a single department, there is a greater or lesser knowledge of GE. We have to make sure that they understand that this is relevant perhaps to their own teaching.

Q: Just for clarity, for one-unit labs. Do they have to be standalone or can they be a part of the classes?

A: Like CAL-GETC, the one-unit lab is in addition and has to be tied down to a course. It cannot be standalone.

C: In regards to looking at this from the student perspective, this can be very confusing. There are a lot of acronyms and there are a lot of things that very few of us have heard about. One thing that we could do is to simplify this and take it to our Academic Affairs Committee. We have student representatives from each college and this is important.

IX. New Business: None

X. State of the University Announcements:

A. Vice President for Student Affairs

VP for Student Affairs, Patrick Day spoke about the parent and family weekend that brought 18,000 people to the campus. We are seeing a different kind of relationship of students being more connected to their parents. This is growing as it was 200 more than we saw last year. Most were parents of the freshmen we have on campus but a number were parents of sophomores and juniors. This is a pattern we see and should pay attention to.

Tomorrow as part of Legacy Month, Ibram Kendi will be speaking for the Spartan Speaker series which will be happening at 6 pm in the Student Union ballroom. We may keep the program hybrid as it allows access to certain folks depending on where they are.

Homecoming is coming up the week of the 22nd. This lines up with the events the President mentioned. We will have a broad series of celebrations like Fire on the Fountain. You are likely to see more parents and families around, so it would be very valuable to put at least one or two of those events on your calendar.

For the first time, we are doing a fall preview before students are admitted. This is inviting people to learn more about our campus so that we can have an earlier engagement with folks. It will be on Oct 27, 9:30-2 p.m., and will be a great event that will include presentations of some of the colleges as a broad university welcome. It allows us to be connected with students and families, earlier in the process.

Regarding the event that the President alluded to, it is sponsored by one of our recognized student organizations. We are providing support like we would do with any student group. We are also aware of the students who are planning protests and have met with them to make sure they know they are supported and are safe as well. We are taking a balanced approach.

Questions:

Q: Will the event tonight be on campus and where?

A: Yes, it will be in the Student Union in the ballroom.

Q: Other universities have had problems with highly controversial events due to the security to keep everyone safe. How expensive are these events for us and can the university sustain this level of security?

A: We are providing a reasonable level of security and providing it at a level that is sustainable. This may be more expensive as we go on but as of now, we are okay. What we are telling groups is that as we continue to have these events there is a cost that might be pushed on to you.

Q: I wanted to check in on the incident that happened with the student. Any resolutions that happened after this? Is the student okay and were they supported? What happens after incidents like this?

A: UPD responded immediately, and the Office of Student Involvement responded immediately as well. The second student was caught within 15 minutes. Things were addressed fairly rapidly, with the appropriate follow-up from a legal and student conduct perspective. We have been in touch with the student and both associations sharing the messaging.

Q: Follow-up on something Senator Mathur brought up last year regarding Scantron machines. The testing office has one scantron machine that is now broken. Now halfway through the semester, I need to switch to a different form that I will need to run through a different institution in order to be graded. Is there another option on campus, or have we explored other options for in-person? It is

starting to look like everyone is going to push for online, whether we like it or not.

A: I got your email and followed up with my team. I will connect with you when I get the answer and I can share it here or directly with you. The Provost and I will also connect on that question as well.

Q: In regards to the event that will anticipate Admitted Spartan Day. Can you speak about the drill down? Probably high school, is my best guess, but even in junior high?

A: The Provost and I are working and thinking about new strategies. This is actually one of the new strategies. Our drill downs, you see some groups happening on campus. We have a particular drill down on the East Side where we have a deeper relationship. We are bringing back the African-American Summit which we stopped doing during the years of Covid. There are also additional drill downs that are happening but one of our biggest challenges is with our students in the community college and getting those transfers. We are developing those relationships.

Q: Regarding these speaker series, and particularly the student groups that are bringing in controversial speakers. Diversity of viewpoints is very important. Do we have any guidance on who we're going to allow to speak and who we're not?

A: My job is to make sure that we allow for multiple viewpoints. We follow what the law says, and short of someone inciting a riot, calling for violence, or grasping behavior, there is nothing that says we can't invite that speaker. This is a challenging conversation. We work with our cultural centers to make sure they are providing support for our students. As a public institution, these are things that we have to live with but we can be clear on what our values are and who we are as a campus.

C: This question was raised from whether or not we can afford the security for controversial speakers. We must afford it based on previous events throughout the CSU.

B. Interim Chief Diversity Office

Interim CDO, Dawn Lee mentioned a lot of what she wanted to show had already been covered so she would be brief to avoid being redundant. Just a couple of things she wanted to draw attention to. You might have missed it earlier this semester. She sent out a message which was co-signed by the Provost and VP of Student Affairs about upcoming religious observances that

included a Google calendar. This should help you plan and talk to your students about how to handle classes.

I have been sending out communications that are co-signed with others. The next one will be regarding the latest Government ruling which lifts the travel ban. My intention in these communications is to recognize what is happening and to openly discuss these issues and I welcome your feedback.

We have been doing microaggression sessions for our MPPs and the staff as well. This summer our IT department had 83 out of 93 members of their staff go through this training. In the post-assessment, we learned that 89% of them felt like they had a strong understanding and ability to identify microaggression. Our MPPS were trained earlier this Spring and there was a session most recently.

Questions & Comments:

C: Just an expression of gratitude for the email that recognized the Jewish holidays. This is the first time I have seen these holidays recognized on the campus. Religion is often ignored as a component of culture which is remarkable because most people have one. I am one of the people who were very pleased to see your email.

C. Associated Students President

Associated Students President Multani stated they are currently looking to revise their budget policy in terms of allocation and funding requests for organizations. This revision would reaffirm the fact that positions, views, and opinions have never and do not affect whether or not a club or organization receives funding from their allocations.

As the VP of Student Affairs mentioned earlier, Homecoming is quickly approaching and our Director of Co-Curricular Affairs and Director of Student Resource Affairs, Michelle & Sam have been working tirelessly on this with company teams. We want to make sure the faculty and staff are involved as you guys are a big part of this university.

Some Senate updates, I have been charged with appointing student seats onto our committees. We still have 26 vacancies, and we've received 9 applications so far. I am working with VP Day on sending out an email and if you feel like you have nominations please reach out to me as well.

In our subcommittee within ISA, we will be working on advising referrals. We are waiting on some updates from Shonda Goward to talk about some of the existing data on advising and how we can move forward with the solution.

Regarding the state of the university, as the President mentioned earlier, she and I have begun scheduling some tabling sessions. We are thinking instead of setting up a program and event we should take ourselves to the students in their space to talk to them, be transparent, and be open-minded, listen, and offer resources.

The last item, I heard concerns about the event today and I just want to say the university collectively handled this really well. We stress free speech, remaining neutral, and providing reassurance to those concerns. As young adults, we expose them to different views. I believe as young adults, it is very important to get exposed to different points of view which prepares students for the real world. They get to learn firsthand how to practice and respond to different opinions and free speech expressions responsibly.

One request, can we please get our Academic Senate website updated with chairs and meeting times? It has been difficult for a lot of the students to figure out which meetings they have time for. This would be extremely helpful to them.

Questions & Comments:

C: Thank you for everything you are doing. Just a suggestion, maybe use faculty as partners to spread emails to their students that might help you. Success Centers as well.

A: I have been giving speeches to my classes and sending out emails to them as well. Please let me know those faculty that are open to help, I will email the entire senate to inquire.

D. Vice President for Administration and Finance

VP of Finance, Charlie Faas thanked everyone who attended the budget summit. He also thanked all those who came up on stage with him and the members of the Budget Advisory Committee who worked to put the presentation together.

There are two good articles in the Spartan Daily on UPD. Please take the time to read these two articles. One is in community policing and first aid which are written from the student's perspective and they nailed it.

Regarding one of the alerts that came out last week about the YUH area where a student was accosted by a 6-foot 219-pound individual with a pair of scissors. The difficult part about my team's efforts, UPD, is that sometimes they do not get told the truth. As we now know, this was something that a student made up. We had to go through a real case, investigate it, send out an alert, and then investigate it which is when the student recanted it and went back on it. Which is what you and the rest of the community do not get to see because we do not put that out.

Questions:

Q: Thank you for the budget summit. It was very informative. Last year you talked about some usages of space on the campus, can you give us an update on the other library spaces?

A: Nirvana Soul is going into the library soon. In the next month or two, the contract is done. This would be their 3rd location.

E. Provost

Provost Del Casino mentioned how Shonda Goward, our Associate Vice Provost for Undergraduate Advising and Student Success, led an effort to get a \$2.8 million grant from the MSI Department of Education to build a program around retaining probation students. This grant is going to include a lot of people and a lot of programs which is pretty exciting.

A message went out regarding the reorganization of the College of Professional and Global Education. I am happy to answer questions about this, what are the next steps, what is going on there?

We are in the middle of the start of RTP season, the files have come in and now the departments are starting to work through that which will be a big part. Because the President has given me the authority to make the final decision as the Provost, we changed the timeline to give the colleges and Deans more time.

Since a question came up regarding tenure density I would like to jump into a quick presentation. I'm going to deconstruct the numbers in that article and offer a sort of walkthrough of what drives it and some of the local challenges. The first slide defines tenure density. Here is the complexity of it, the definition is the ratio of tenure track instructional faculty and they pull this data from the behavioral system. This accounts for the total number of people. A tenure track faculty member not in the faculty early retirement programs is 1 point. Then they go in and look at the instructional fractions of each non-tenure track faculty and they

bring them all together and you get a number and you divide. Important to note this is a fall number only and they use the fall after census.

In the 2021 article, we had 731 tenure track faculty and 696 equivalent full-time lectures which gave us a 51.2%. In 2022 we reported an uptick of 52.1% density that was based on 744 tenure track and 683 full-time lecturers. We have not yet calculated the 2023 percentage. But for context to this presentation in 2018 the tenure track number was 696 but the density was 53.6%. We increased it by 48 headcount tenure track faculty but decreased tenure density in that period. We have had a pretty good tenure track faculty since the last time I reported to the Senate based on 2 things, hiring and successful retention.

The second slide of the presentation presents the numbers for the “good campuses,” campuses with very high tenure faculty which can be a little misleading when all the campuses are treated equally. On the screen are campuses with very high tenure & tenure track densities, San Francisco, Chico, East Bay, and Humboldt. All of these campuses have had a significant enrollment decline. This is not a strategy for increasing tenure density, this is the result of enrollment change and likely a decline in lecturing faculty. There are some exceptions, Maritime, San Luis Obispo, San Diego State, Northridge, and Sacramento.

The next slide focuses on San Luis Obispo, there is something we need to understand which is that not all campuses are created equal. SJSU brings in \$7,992 in California resident tuition and fees. For international students, we have a nonresident fee for those who take 30 units a year; it is \$11,880. This is our revenue based on the state side. San Luis Obispo has a California resident tuition fee of \$11,706 and a non-resident fee of \$11,880 along with what they call an opportunity fee for all non-residents of \$8,304. If you go there as a non-resident student and live in the dorms the annual cost of education is \$55,000. This means they have \$3,714 more dollars per California resident than we do plus the \$8,304. This is definitely a piece of the puzzle when you look comparatively at the campuses.

The next slide focuses on what local decisions impact density. I want to point to two right away. The first is the RSCA program and the second is the student/faculty ratio. If you go back to 2017, we are spending about a million dollars on the RSCA program and we are now at 5 million. This is a 4 million dollar annual difference which is equivalent to 57 full-time faculty. If we did not have this program our tenure density would be 2.1% higher assuming we could

recruit and retain all the faculty. There is only one other campus with this level of investment in the RSCA program, San Diego State.

The next slide focuses on what other local factors play into the density formula. I have been over-investing in this, not the faculty minimum. Investments in the radical program have been 1 million a year. In the last two years, I have granted sabbaticals to all eligible faculty who have been recommended. I have not been using the contractual minimum in fact I have over-invested in this. The 1 million dollars goes into hiring non-tenure-track faculty, this changes the relationship of tenure density. The Chair refresh program which is under 50k a year, also has an impact. Administrative assigned time, which is roughly 5 million dollars a year also leads into the RSCA program.

The average faculty workload of tenure track faculty for instruction is just shy of 50%, i.e. a 2-2 load when you add it all up and put the chairs in. For research expenditures, we have \$660,000 in research buyouts. This all goes in and produces the denominator. There are all other kinds of things and some intangibles like curricular complexity that mandate smaller courses.

If you look by category, the student-faculty ratios are lower for the tenure-track faculty. We've had a demonstrable increase in lecturer faculty and a drive-down in the student-faculty ratio which has precipitated more non-tenure track hiring. All of these things combine into the ratio.

The last slide was about the big questions. Would we recruit all of these people without the programs we put into place? The strategies we have put into place to get where we are have made the lift in tenure density difficult. I would love to see more full-time people in general and start to think about our full-time density. Invest in people, give them good salaries, and have lecturers who have a full load. This would probably be a better representation but until we get to a place where we can start to balance out some of those costs and deal with the realities, we won't.

Questions & Comments

C: While the numbers paint a momentary picture of our campus, the movement of the number as the progress eloquently explained should not be overrated. In 2001 the State Legislature passed ACR 73, which urged the CSUs to have a 75% tenure density. This is not a law, it is a recommendation by the Assembly and by the Legislature but they do not give us any money for this. In 2017 or 2018, the average tenure density in the CSU was 54% and San Jose State was

right in the middle. I predict in the next 2 years, tenure density will go up but sadly due to the anticipated budget constraints, we will not hire many faculty on the tenure track or lecturers will not be hired or reappointed. When you lose a lecturer, your tenure density goes up but this might be painful for some of our colleagues. Another way to increase tenure density when budget times get better is by hiring a new tenure-line faculty. But the best way we could double the effect is if we take a current lecturer and hire them on the tenure track because we eliminate a lecturer in a positive way.

Q: Even though we have hired more of these faculty than anyone else in the CSU we are exactly where we were in 2014. Is there any hope that we might hire without firing a lot of temporary faculty? Could we learn a little more in the budget report about how many faculty tenure faculty we are losing to attrition? Finally, we are hiring 70 a year and the ratio wasn't changing which kinda suggests we need to hire 70 a year so our ratio doesn't change. Do we stand to dip below 50%?

A: I do not want to lose sight that we are the top 3 in the system in terms of total tenure track faculty. Some of the decisions we have made including the curricular ones, the SFT, and other things like this are driving the change. We have added people to the campus while we went through a 1,500 FTES drop in enrollment which does not make a lot of sense. I am all for getting lectures into tenure-track jobs but this is a very local decision. You have to remember that for each new tenure track faculty member you go from 15 units of teaching to 9 which is a change of 6 units. This is something you have to locally think about.

Q: Do we have any data from UP or Faculty Affairs regarding exit data, why are faculty leaving?

A: [Joanne] We have a system called HSD metrics and it's an anonymous survey system and people decide if they want to answer or not. We just started this so we are collecting data.

XI. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.