

**2024-2025 Academic Senate Minutes**  
**March 17, 2025**

**I. Call to Order and Roll Call**

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m., and 42 Senators were present.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Ex Officio:</b><br>Present: Curry, Lacson, Rodan, Sasikumar,<br>Van Selst<br>Absent:                                | <b>HHS Representatives:</b><br>Present: Baur, Chang, Sen<br>Absent:                              |
| <b>Administrative Representatives:</b><br>Present: Del Casino, Teniente-Matson<br>Absent: Dukes, Nosek, Fuentes-Martin | <b>COB Representatives:</b><br>Present: Chen, Pruthi<br>Absent: Vogel                            |
| <b>Deans / AVPs:</b><br>Present: d'Alarcao, Kaufman<br>Absent: Meth, Shillington                                       | <b>EDUC Representatives:</b><br>Present: Mathur<br>Absent: Munoz-Munoz                           |
| <b>Students:</b><br>Present: Brown, Gambarin, Joshi, Nwokolo<br>Absent: Khehra   | <b>ENGR Representatives:</b><br>Present: Bellofiore, Elahi, Sullivan-Green, Wong<br>Absent:      |
| <b>Alumni Representative:</b><br>Absent: Vacant  | <b>H&amp;A Representatives:</b><br>Present: Frazier, Kataoka, Riley, Shojaei<br>Absent: Han, Lee |
| <b>Emeritus Representative:</b><br>Present: Jochim<br>Absent:  | <b>SCI Representatives:</b><br>Present: Heindl, Shaffer, Madura, Muller<br>Absent:               |
| <b>Honorary Representative:</b><br>Present: Peter, Lessow-Hurley<br>Absent:  | <b>SOS Representatives:</b><br>Present: Buyco, Hart, Raman, Pinnell<br>Absent: Meniketti         |
| <b>General Unit Representatives:</b><br>Present: Pendyala, Masegian, Velarde<br>Absent:                                |  |

**II. Land Acknowledgement:**

Senator Pruthi read the land acknowledgement.

**III. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes:**

**A. Senate Minutes of February 24, 2025- approved unanimously.**

**IV. Communications and Questions**

**A. From the Chair of the Senate**

Welcome to all senators and guests. My update today is short. I am very pleased to announce that University Personnel has shared the names of the staff senators who were elected last week. They

are Harish Chander and Sabrina Porter-Parees. Harish Chander is a Senior PeopleSoft Analyst Programmer and the Chair of the Staff Council. Sabrina is the past vice-chair of the Staff Council and is currently the analyst in the Dean's office at the College of Health and Human Sciences. We will welcome Harish and Sabrina on May 5, 2025.

In addition, we now have the names of the senators who were appointed to one-year terms by the Senate Executive Committee for those colleges that did not fill their seats by election. They are Ryan Skinnell from the College of Humanities and the Arts, Dawn Hackman from the General Unit (she is a Librarian), Vlad Ionescu and Maria Chierichetti from the College of Engineering, and Dashiell Fryer from the College of Science.

I would also like to mention that Ray Buyco from the College of Social Sciences has agreed to serve a three-year term as SJSU's representative to the ASCSU lecturer electorate.

This morning, I participated in the first of two AI forums organized by the Curriculum and Research Committee. About twenty faculty members were in the audience, and it was a lively debate. The second forum is on Monday, March 24, from 10 to 11.30, also in the same venue, MLK Library 225. I urge you to attend and share your views on this important issue.

Questions:

Q: How many people were online for the AI Forum?

A: 45

Q: Are the forums recorded, and are there any opportunities to provide other kinds of feedback to the committee for reflection?

A: Yes, they were recorded and shared with faculty, and there was an anonymous survey link for feedback.

## **B. From the President**

Judy Nagai reported to me at the end of last month that we raised approximately \$21.6 million, and we're on track to meet or exceed our goal this year of \$25 million. We also had the highest Day of Giving, beating out last year and bringing in a record \$3.6 million. Additionally, our Men's Basketball program was invited to the NIT men's basketball tournament, which was announced live last night on different news channels. This is the second appearance in SJSU's history. The last time we played at this national stage was in 1981. This will also be the first time we will host the event in SJSU's history. Tip-off is at 8:00 pm, and we will be live on ESPN for over two hours. This is great for the university and our athletics programs, particularly men's basketball. Tickets went on sale last night at 10 pm, and we're rapidly moving with many initiatives to ensure students can attend. We would love to see all our faculty and staff there, and promotions will be going around soon. Tomorrow, we are hosting the first-ever live stream of

Nvidia's GTC conference in the Event Center. There are many promos for this event, but above all else, it is an excellent opportunity for all our students and the community to be there. This is the first livestream Nvidia is doing at a public university like ours, and CEO Jensen Huang's address will be live-streamed. We also asked Nvidia and some of our partners to bring over AI industry experts to talk to our students about a career in the future. Nvidia will be giving away a lot of swag, like 500 or so event passes, to the GTC conference exhibition hall and other things. They will also be giving away a GPU signed by the CEO, and you must be present to win it. This event is open to all SJSU students and the neighboring Bay Area schools. This is a significant part of our partnership that we have going forward with Nvidia and leveraging our excellence.

Last Friday was World Sleep Day. Under the supervision of Dr. Sean Laraway in Psychology, SJSU's own Cassie Hilditch, who is working on collaborative research with NASA Ames, was featured in a four-minute segment on The Today Show. It is an incredible deep dive in which SJSU has been mentioned numerous times, and it gives a lot of credence to our being an R2 institution. Last week, it was a great accolade for our university to be recognized in the national news that way and for the Research Foundation, which the faculty members doing this work are employed under at NASA Ames.

The WASC visit is in 24 days. Last week, I had the first call with the chair, the same chair and committee that will be back here in 24 days. The Provost and many people are prepared with all the logistics, details, and event schedule, and everything has come together.

We must remember our focus on a community of care and our ongoing commitment to our student body and community. I've heard from students and faculty the sense of anxiety about what's going on in the world, with the changes in policies that are coming out of our federal government. Since I couldn't attend the last Senate meeting, I want to discuss the Dear Colleague letter you probably heard about. Since then, many other things have happened, but one thing to keep in mind is that we remain 100% committed to the work we're doing, our institutional mission, our values, and our community of care. We remain committed to Prop 209 as the overriding framework for how we approach our work here at San Jose State University. The cabinet members and I have taken a proactive look at all our websites and have ensured that our websites are compliant with the Prop 209 language. If you are following the federal messaging around this, you know that about 100 phrases or matching of words are now questionable by the federal government. Those are some of the watches we are looking at on our websites to ensure that we're consistent and compliant with Prop 209. We're not changing anything other than ensuring that our language is compliant where it's not. We know that since that Dear Colleague's letter, several things have happened. The investigation into antisemitism activities that are occurring at which Sacramento State is one of the 60 universities. Two CSUs were also mentioned in the 60 institutions being investigated around DEI programs. We also know a significant number of layoffs have been announced in the Department of Education, including many members in the San Francisco office and many members of the Office of Civil Rights. So, we are navigating carefully through all of this and ensuring that we can communicate with you in the best way possible when there are items that require change.

On February 5th, President Trump issued an Executive Order called Keeping Men out of Women's Sports, and on the 6th, the Department of Education announced its directed investigations. SJSU is one of the institutions being investigated. A directed investigation means no complaints have been filed, however, the Department of Ed is aware of the matter, so they're taking it upon themselves to investigate. We received the letter on February 13th asking us for a specific long list of data pursuant to the following question. "Whether the university denies equal effort, benefits, and opportunities to females through an athletic participation policy that permits biological males to participate in women's intercollegiate athletics." They have requested four years' worth of data. On March 6th, we submitted a response to the data, over 10,000 pages of documents that we submitted online to the San Francisco office. We did receive notice after some of the reductions in force; this investigation will be reviewed by the Seattle office.

Last Friday, through one of the President's messages, other changes were in place, which impacted a couple of agencies, including the Institute of Museum and Library Services, through which we have some funding. This agency is now being eliminated. We are preparing and anticipating what may be next and how we will prepare our university community for those next steps. I want to repeat that we aren't changing any of our work or the efforts that we're making, but we are ensuring that we're acting consistently across all of our programs and the work that we have ahead.

At the January spring address, I mentioned that as we're preparing for budget reductions, we will take a budget reduction in athletics. I have not backed away from the notion that athletics will take a budget reduction; however, as we go through this directed investigation, there will be a detailed look at all of our gender equity compliance, Title IX compliance and the list of initiatives within the NCAA requirement which may prevent some immediate budget reductions until we have a stable sense of where this investigation is going to go in terms of compliance. I am working very closely with Athletics on what all these implications will mean in the assessment of our Title IX and gender equity compliance.

I have received several questions from staff about the governor's four-day in-office mandate. That directive does not apply to the CSU; however, it did prompt my office and UP to look at where we are on our telecommuting agreements and remote work policies. So we're taking another look at that since some of our policies and agreements are out of date or not current. This is not a direct response to the governor's mandate, but we are looking at all the policies in general.

We had about a dozen people register for the asynchronous TPM training. One person has completed it so far, so we are circling back within our circle of influence for the TPM training as we get through the rest of the semester, whether we have protests or not. We want to ensure that we consistently apply our TPM policies, which requires another training level. I also continue to work with many individuals about our classroom technology project. I'll be bringing back a deeper review of that to the Executive Committee. And then back to the Senate next month.

I am on the AI Workforce Acceleration Board and speaking on some of the conversations held this morning and again next week. The system had its first meeting on March 6th, and I will ensure Senator Wong gets some updates from me; however, the first meeting was more of an

orientation between members. It has become more apparent that there are three major projects that we need to initiate over the next 12 to 18 months, which our People Centered Excellence work will wrap around. The three are CSU Buy, CSU Travel, and CHRS Readiness as we move on to the new system. There's a lot of work in terms of consistency and process mapping that will be occurring to support that.

Finally, last Friday, we received a notification from the Department of Justice. As you know, over the previous several years, we have been working together as a university community to help share our culture and bring to life new practices due to some very painful activities in our university history. Again, we want to celebrate the survivors and the advocates who brought their claims forward. The Department of Justice has been reviewing all of the work we have been doing over those many years, and we were able to close out our resolution agreement in full compliance now with the standards imposed on the university through the Department of Justice.

Questions:

C/Q: I want to highlight the 10th annual faculty-student dinner, which was last Wednesday. It was a fantastic event, and I want to thank the team that put it together. In the Senate Executive minutes, I noted that you were surprised by some of the reorganization processes and the outcomes of the reports in UP. Do you have any additional information that you can share?

A: On our campus, we are upfront about all reorganizations. I am reviewing those, and they will have my signature on them. I will also discuss them with the cabinet and, if appropriate, here at the Senate or the Senate Executive. I am not making any changes relative to the work that occurred at UP in the reorganization.

Q: How far is the work being done on SJSU websites to look for language that might not be in compliance with Prop 209? Is it department-level? Faculty pages?

A: There is software that we can run that can look at every page associated with sjsu.edu. We can do an engine crawl of everything, and there is a very detailed review through the IT department and the web office. We then lifted the information through some human engagement to see what this means, and we did several iterations. Now, the work is being reviewed by the vice presidents across the university. So, for some events, we're making sure that it's clear that they're open to all members of the university community, which, in essence, Prop 209 does not allow any form of discrimination, and that everything we do with state funding is subject to that. We have been under Prop 209 for about 30 years.

C/Q: In regards to the February 19th incident, a narrative emerged that a faculty member assaulted an SJSU student, and, at least to the best of my understanding, that narrative is a false narrative. No charges have been brought, and the alleged victim is not a student either. I would ask that the report by the independent investigator be released in full as much as is permitted and that the university make a statement correcting this false narrative, specifically, as I mentioned, that no charges were brought. The alleged victim was not an SJSU student.

A: I will go back and look at the messaging, but as I recall, I don't believe it was ever indicated that the victim was a student, but I will double-check.

Q: What are the discussions among CSU presidents about responding to the clear attacks on higher education?

A: I went to every college in this country this semester, indicating that it was my responsibility to ensure that we provided the best support we could provide for our students and community without being targeted, especially if we were under investigation. Also, with the help of our CDO, we have been hosting campus conversations to ensure we have places where we can have open discussions about all that we're doing and bolstering more support where we can. Indeed, I don't think there's a perfect answer for how we proceed in this manner to keep our students healthy, safe, and emotionally well in this period of time.

Q/C: When Prop 209 was introduced, it was against affirmative action, and it effectively did away with race-based, ethnic-based, and gender-based admissions, contracting, and public employment. It is difficult to hear language like we remain committed to Prop 209. Would you consider not saying that we remain committed to Prop 209 in your future statements, but rather that we are compliant? That we interpret Prop 209 in a manner that allows us to honor the people that we represent.

A: I don't have a problem with that. I think that is how it is applied here in our cultural centers and all of the work we do, including the celebrations we have at commencement and numerous events around the campus. Thank you for the insight.

C: Sense of the Senate Resolution F96-4 Support for Educational Equity Programs in the CSU and Opposition to the California Civil Rights Initiative shows that this body is on record opposing Prop 209 because, at the time, it was seen by this body as an attack on our students.

## **V. Executive Committee Report:**

### **A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:**

**Executive Committee Minutes of February 10, 2025**

**Executive Committee Minutes of February 17, 2025**

**Executive Committee Minutes of March 3, 2025**

C: In the February 10th meeting, a point was made about the low attendance at the Senate Retreat. Has there been more discussion about the nature of those retreats moving forward? Those retreats are supposed to be a place to generate new policies, reflect on our policies, and so on.

A: We have discussed this in different forums and have a couple of ideas proposed, like changing the frequency and modality every two years and maybe having a BBQ.

### **B. Consent Calendar- Consent Calendar for March 17, 2025**

Q: To the student senators, why are you all doing two to three seats? Do you not have enough people?

A: We have some vacancies on our board, which we have filled now, and we are starting to reassign seats to the committees.

C. Executive Committee Action Items: None

**I. Unfinished Business:**

Senator Baur presented **AS 1888 Senate Management Resolution to Amend Bylaws 4.5 and 4.6 and Senate Policy S19-2, Appendix A (Second Reading)**.

The feedback from the first reading was taken into account. We are no longer proposing to split ISA, but it can still be reduced by removing some seats. To place the new faculty senators, they will be senators-at-large and represent the university as a whole, not just their college. They will be placed on O&G, PS, and one on the University Library Board. Also, colleges with two or fewer senators will be given priority in our committee placements. Staff senators will be placed on O&G, ISA, and C&R.

Questions

Q: Would you consider changing the senator-at-large to a “faculty senator” at large to be clearer, since we will have staff senators as well?

Q: Bylaw 6.1 also covers what is added in 4.5.2.1, which states that all senators represent the whole university. Also, specify that the staff senator on ISA is an SSP. Regarding the ULB in charge, it serves as a policy committee regarding the library policy, so it is a great idea to have a senator on that board. It brings about even more of a tie between the Senate and that body. Finally, I love the idea that our policy committees will be all senators. I think it will improve the work on the policy committees since all the members can see what happens to the policies they work on here in the Senate.

C: Would the three-year term of the faculty senator on the ULB coincide with their senate term? If not, they would have to step off, and that would be hard to keep track of.

C: I would be in favor of switching the two staff senators on C&R to OG, and get one staff senator and one faculty senator. We have a staff senator right now on C&R who helps bring information about graduate life because she is an SSP, so we might also want to specify the staff senator on C&R be an SSP.

C: C&R has three EXOs, not two.

C: When adding staff seats to the Senate, a big distinction was made between SSPs and staff at

large. The reason is that SSPs tend to work with policy. Staff at large can work with policy, or they may not. I'm on a committee that works with policy that directly impacts what we do on a day-to-day basis. What time of matching will there be to ensure that the four staff senators are on the correct policy committee for them, and that committee is based on their knowledge?

C: We could do something similar to what we did with the graduate student on ISA, which says it “gives preference.” So, on the policy committee, there would be a preference for staff from certain designations, but not mandated, and then the staff would sort of self-select with direction.

C: On the committee preference form, a faculty member or staff member chooses which committees they would like to apply for, and they rank their top three. They also submit a statement. So, it assumes that anyone who applies will sort of find which committee works best for them. The charges are listed so everyone can see what the committee does. However, the committee preference form will not be updated with all that is in the SMR since it has not been passed yet, but the ConC is keeping all that is in the SMR in mind.

Q: Why were there two staff seats on C&R compared to ISA? I feel like staff do more with instruction and student affairs issues. On C&R, they would vote on the curriculum.

#### **Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation):**

A. University Library Board (ULB):

B. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

Senator Riley presented **AS 1885 Amendment E to F12-6, Evaluation in Effectiveness in Teaching for all Faculty (Final Reading)**.

At the first reading, we received a lot of insightful feedback, and we've gone back and done our due diligence. I want to point out that everything you see in section five of the policy is everything in the policy at present, and anything in ~~strikeout~~ is proposed to be removed.

#### Questions

Q: Under the current implementation, preliminary grades are available for students early on. This policy talks about before final grades are due. Are final grades due before preliminary grades are available?

A: We did not discuss when preliminary grades are available because preliminary grades are always available if students check their courses in Canvas. The procedural question that would be our main focus was that there was no clear language about the final day of the university's published time frame for culminating activities. We felt that was useful. Also, the number of classes being taught by faculty on our campus today is much shorter than the regular semester. In some cases, the way SOTEs are currently collected in the final ten calendar days works fine. However, in winter sessions, for example, the classes are very short. The SOTE would open up

on day five, and not setting it at all like we currently do for winter sessions can be problematic for faculty evaluation packets.

### **AS 1885 passed 32-0-0**

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

Senator Sullivan Green presented **AS 1891 Amendment C to S17-13, Undergraduate Student Honors, at SJSU (First Reading)**.

This is one of two referrals pending in ISA, and we feel this amendment should come forth now because it may influence actions in the fall semester. The other referral can be delayed; we hope to bring it for at least a first reading later this semester. This amendment allows full-time students taking at least 12 units but taking a course that has Credit/No Credit to be still eligible for honors as long as they are taking at least eight units of letter grade work. We are proposing this because we have several majors that require internships and practica that are mandated to be graded Credit/No Credit, which are not eligible for honors; however, they are full-time students in good standing and satisfying their degree requirements. This would provide flexibility to ensure that all of our students are given reasonable opportunities to achieve honors. Section 1.2 has a footnote referring to all appropriate university policies associated with grading. Then, the changes to 2.2 reflect that students must take at least 12 units, but eight must be letter-graded instead of all 12.

Questions:

Q: I support this, but would you consider not having eight units since many courses are three units? That might require some students to add a graded course to get to about eight.

A: We did have a conversation about how many of those Credit/No Credit out of those 12 that are required for this standard to be permitted to be Credit/No Credit, and the consensus that sort of worked to satisfy most circumstances was that eight would allow students to take a least one Credit/No Credit class, and 3 or 4 units since some classes are four units. However, recognizing that we looked at six units, we felt like eight was a little more reasonable for standards while also maintaining a student achievement threshold.

Q: Do you plan on keeping the requirements in 2.2?

A: That is one of those conditions we would love to maintain in the policy. But given the current limitations on PeopleSoft and the requirements for the registrar's excellent staff who have to check these things manually, that standard is just not feasible right now. In the Whereas clauses, it is indicated that the Provost will provide resources to update PeopleSoft so that more of this process can be automated instead of being manually completed. When that happens, that would be a condition that we would like to see return to the policy. However, given the difficulty in sustaining that right now, we felt it wasn't appropriate to keep it in the policy at this time. It is something that is not being implemented right now.

Q: It is my understanding that when students graduate, their transcripts get frozen. If a student has an I or an RV, that grade gets cleared, and then they graduate. Is it possible to edit the transcript to indicate honors status then?

A: CSU policy says that once a degree is posted, it should be finalized; however, it does allow for judgment, so that is what we stick with. Anytime there is an administrative error, we can reopen. Generally speaking, a student would never be able to graduate given an I or RV. This would have been something that would have happened in the past, and it is more than likely that we would be correcting it because policies might have been applied too rigidly in the past. We try to be very student-centered. If a student has an I grade, we do not confer the degree until that I grade is completed, and then at that moment, we re-examine everything to recalculate the GPA.

Q: What is the percentage of our students who would currently be deemed Dean's Scholars, and what are we allowed by the Chancellor's office?

A: There are no rules, and there are about 2700 Presidential Scholars in any given year.

Q: How will the CR grades be calculated in terms of GPA? Are they not counted at all? Senate policy F18-5 says that CR grades, at a minimum, for undergraduates need a C minus or better.

A: Credit/No Credit grades are not included in the GPA calculations at all. It is just a credit indicating they've satisfied that course requirement. They have earned units, but they have not earned graded units. So, in that case, the GPA for that student would only be based on the letter-graded work. The classes that are automatically graded with Credit/No Credit don't assign a letter grade. However, if a student elects to change a letter-graded course to a Credit/No Credit grade, which is allowed for university electives only, only specific majors permit university electives. High-unit majors like engineering don't have university electives as part of a 120-unit program. Our students are not eligible to select Credit/No Credit. But in that case, the instructor would give them a letter grade, then, at the registrar level, as long as it's a C minus or better, would change to credit, meaning the student satisfied the course requirement and completed the earned units. However, the grade units are not based on those units.

C: The point that you brought up about it being equal to a C minus or better. That's primarily for whether or not you can specify a requirement within the curriculum.

C: In 2.7.3, we should consider as much flexibility as possible in how we recognize the large number of honors students, as well as the flexibility that students have, need, or want. How we contemplate this important recognition for students may or may not be a traditional honors convocation. So, I find this particular language a little bit restrictive, so I just ask you to think about how we can be more flexible with whatever this looks like.

A: Our other referral is specifically in regards to that. ISA is collecting information from faculty and students to find a way to update that language to ensure that how we honor these high-achieving students is meaningful to them. We are looking at updating that, and that is what we hope to bring for a first read, at least by the end of this academic year. There is potentially a final read at the beginning of next year, enabling it to impact how we honor them next spring. So, we

are explicitly addressing that clause in our other work right here.

Senator Mathur moved to suspend the rules and move AS 1891 to a final reading. The motion passed 27-3-1.

Debate

C: The committee has discussed this extensively, and returning it to the committee will not bring about significant changes.

**AS 1891 passed 30-0-2**

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

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

**II. Special Committee Reports:**

**III. New Business:**

Senator Peter presented **AS 1889, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Honoring Dr. Peter Buzanski (1929-2024) (Final Reading)**

Senator Frazier moved to adopt AS 1889, and Senator Curry seconded it.

Mathur amendment “Dr. Peter Buzanski served as a mentor for incoming senate chairs and was always willing to share his wisdom, wit, and knowledge of SJSU history, decision-making, and campus process;” and add Dr. in front of Peter Buzanski in all four resolved clauses.

Riley amendment: “Whereas: Dr. Peter Buzanski passed away in 2024, entrusting us with SJSU's powerful legacy of shared governance; and” and add “ for the 2025-26”

AS 1889 passed by acclamation after it was read in full by senators and guests who knew Dr. Peter Buzanski.

Senator Masegian presented **AS 1890, a Sense of the Senate Resolution, Supporting the Establishment of a CSU Systemwide Staff Council (Final Reading)**

Several senators were consulted in the process of developing the SOS. Given the CSU and Chancellor's Office's continuing focus on shared governance and specific support of shared governance system-wide level, and the recent successes here at SJSU to intentionally include staff voices and shared governance in the form of four new staff Senate seats. And given that other CSU campuses have passed or are in the process of passing resolutions in support of the

CSU system-wide staff council or other such entity. The campuses that have already passed resolutions are Channel Islands and Sonoma State. Those in progress are Long Beach, Chico, and, most recently, Humboldt State. So, SJSU wanted to lend our support to the request that the Chancellor's office establish a systemwide council specifically for those staff members and processes that make up one-third of the employees across the CSUs. We already have a faculty system-wide body and a student system-wide body, but there is no equivalent for staff. So, this resolution calls on the Chancellor's office to establish such an entity.

Questions

Q: Is there any resistance to creating this?

A: Not that I know of.

Q: What will the council be in charge of?

A: At this point, the constitution and bylaws are being drafted to lay out the charge and duties. We are in the process of getting campus polls behind these initiatives before we present the proposal. This resolution does mention, but currently, the only system-wide representation is through the unions, which have two different unions for staff, so there's not even a unifying thing in and of itself. I think part of it is just to respond to system-wide issues that aren't addressed by the unions and affect staff, whether that be policy-related or just general health, wellness, and retention.

**AS 1890 passed 31-0-0**

#### **IV. State of the University Announcements:**

##### **A. AS President**

This past weekend, Senator Gambarin and I visited Sacramento for the March CSSA plenary meeting and the California Higher Education Student Summit. At the plenary meeting, we approved our first resolution of the year, which supported a CSU system-wide undocumented student advisory council framework. This was passed unanimously. We also approved co-sponsoring several bills brought forward by different legislators. Last Monday, we met with many different legislators and advocated for supporting undocumented students, supporting financial aid, and reducing the total cost of attendance. We are all very aware of the CSU budget cut proposed by Governor Newsom, so we met with legislators and told them how detrimental that would be for the CSU system and the students. We were also able to advocate for the Cal Grant reform.

Additionally, I was able to author and present a resolution supporting trans students to the CSSA system-wide affairs committee. This is a very comprehensive resolution that discusses all the Executive Orders signed by President Trump. It's being circulated across all 23 CSU campuses and will be up for a vote in May. I am very passionate about this. I think that two of the most targeted groups from the federal administration are our trans students and athletes, and our undocumented students.

We finally have a full board again, and we have a new director of students' rights and responsibilities. AS also unanimously passed a letter of support for trans athletes and trans students, which we will forward to our campus administration, the Chancellor's Office, the Board of Trustees, and other elected officials.

#### B. CSU Statewide Representative(s)

We just had our ASCSU March plenary meeting, where we added an extra day for the conference, which has not happened since 2017. Once again, the Chancellor was not in attendance at the plenary. However, we did receive reports from the Interim Vice Chair for Human Resources and the new Civil Rights and Services, Peter Lim. They provided updates on CSU policy changes and took questions for further discussion. The Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs and the Chief Academic Officer focused on questions that were raised during the meeting with the executive committee of the CSU Senate, which had to do with issues raised regarding the Executive Orders. In my report, I list the issues that were addressed. It seems that the Chancellor's office has been very busy. They indicated they have been speaking out behind the scenes in partnership with the state legislature, the CA AG, and others. The topic of website crawling, as our President mentioned, was one of the issues brought up, and AVC Evans and Perez indicated that there is no CSU policy on scrubbing websites. However, several senators noted that their campuses were scrubbing their websites. DC Evans told us that some injunctions have been successful, but threats continue to rise. He reiterated that the TPM policy must be consistently applied to ensure that we have a standard known by all, which is expected and in compliance at the CSU. The word compliance was stated too many times as to why we must obey what is happening, and the way that we must protect ourselves. One of the main reasons for holding back responses is the fear of losing federal government funding.

The senators expressed that communication of the CSU's support of the faculty is needed. We were all very thankful that while the Chancellor wasn't present to answer any of these questions or concerns, her representatives were there to address her issues. The President of CFA also addressed us as he does regularly during the plenary. One thing I focused on from his report was that the CFA is discussing the issues over the budget and a lack of budget transparency, particularly in light of the AI expenditure. The Faculty Affairs chair from Sonoma State raised the concern that 147 faculty members, including tenured faculty, have been given layoff notices. The call to action was what happens when they come for you. Some commentary on this was that this is a preliminary insight into the continuation of the fight against tenure.

During this meeting, we had our faculty trustee elections, and we elected Dr. Beth Steffel, the Immediate Past Chair and Professor at San Bernardino, and Dr. Steven Filling, Vice-Chair of Justice, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (JEDI) permanent standing policy committee, and Professor at Stanislaus. These names will be sent to the governor so that one faculty trustee can be selected. We also approved various resolutions, which I have listed in my report. The ASCSU Conference's theme was Faculty Experiences and Perspectives in the CSU. Unlike prior conferences, the objective was to hear faculty voices and what they experienced as faculty

members.

C. Provost

I have met with various groups around campus to discuss what's happening worldwide and in this country. I have been trying my best to answer as many main questions as possible. I will be presenting at the GTC conference on Wednesday.

D. Vice President for Administration and Finance- Not in attendance

E. Vice President for Student Affairs- Not in attendance

F. Chief Diversity Officer - Not in attendance

**V. Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.