

2024-2025 Academic Senate Minutes
November 4, 2024

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 2:01 p.m., and 48 Senators were present.

Ex Officio: Present: Curry, Lacson, Sasikumar, Van Selst, Rodan Absent: None	HHS Representatives: Present: Baur, Chang, Sen Absent:
Administrative Representatives: Present: Del Casino, Dukes, Faas, Fuentes-Martin, Teniente-Matson Absent: None	COB Representatives: Present: Chen, Vogel Absent:
Deans / AVPs: Present: d'Alarcao, Meth, Kaufman, Shillington Absent: None	EDUC Representatives: Present: Mathur, Munoz-Munoz Absent:
Students: Present: Gambarin, Joshi, Nwokolo, Sadawarti Absent: Plazola, Khehra	ENGR Representatives: Present: Elahi, Kao Absent: Sullivan-Green, Wong
Alumni Representative: Absent: Vacant	H&A Representatives: Present: Frazier, Kataoka, Lee, Riley, Shojaei Absent: Han
Emeritus Representative: Present: Jochim Absent:	SCI Representatives: Present: Heindl, Shaffer, Madura, Muller Absent:
Honorary Representative: Present: Peter, Absent: Lessow-Hurley	SOS Representatives: Present: Buyco, Hart, Raman, Pinnell, Meniketti Absent:
General Unit Representatives: Present: Flandez, Masegian, Pendyala, Velarde Absent:	

Senator Mathur called for a motion to amend the agenda to add the election calendar.

Senator Mathur's motion was friendly to the body.

II. Land Acknowledgement:

Senator Vogel read the land acknowledgment.

III. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes:

A. Senate Minutes of September 30, 2024 - approved unanimously

B. Senate Minutes of October 14, 2024- approved unanimously

IV. Communications and Questions

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Welcome to the penultimate meeting of the semester. As you can see from the agenda, we have a fairly packed schedule today. We have one more meeting in December, on December 9. The president/ Senator Teniente Matson has invited us to her house on November 13, 2024, from 3 to 5 PM. You will be glad to know that I am NOT in charge of the menu, so there will be tasty and not necessarily only healthy food options. The past chairs of the Senate were invited to a breakfast on October 29. Senators Frazier, Kaufman, Lessow-Hurley, Peter, and Mathur were in attendance, as they are also past chairs. I was grateful that so many others came who are in retirement: Bethany Shifflett, Lynda Heiden, Beth von Till, Alison McKee, Michael Kimbarow, and Pam Stacks. Sigurd Meldal even joined us from India on Zoom.

In October, I sent an email to faculty members requesting a vote. Now, this may have been a bit confusing since the referendum was NOT on the expansion of the SJSU senate but on the amendment of the ASCSU constitution to add lecturers. The timing of this was above my pay grade, so I apologize for any confusion. I can now report on the referendum results: 149 yes, 14 no, and 4 abstain. The other CSUs will vote on this, and we are waiting to hear from the ASCSU chair about the results. I would also like to report on the constitution of the Academic Freedom Committee. This committee was established last year, but for various reasons, it was only formed this semester. The committee has 7 members. It has a student and I'm happy to report that the student, who is nominated by Associated Students, is Senator Leo Plazola. The administrator, nominated by the President, is Chief of Staff Shawn Whalen. The staff member, who was chosen by the Senate Executive Committee, is Neil Ordinario from the University Library. There are four faculty members on this committee. Three are Senators Caroline Chen, Kenneth Peter, Sabrina Pinnell. The fourth faculty member is Professor Ayce Erdogan from Engineering.

We witnessed shared governance in action as the Organization and Government Committee chaired by Joshua Baur conducted a hearing on Monday, October 28, 2024. SJSU policy S13-9: Merging, Dividing, Transferring, Eliminating Academic Units, provides guidance on ensuring procedural transparency and facilitating full participation of affected faculty, students, and staff whenever there is a proposed merger, division, transfer or elimination of an academic unit or department. Item #7 of that policy states that: "If any parties involved in the process believe that policy was not followed, they may request a hearing before the Organization and Government (O&G) Committee of the Academic Senate.... O&G will not evaluate the merits of the proposed reorganization, only whether the principle of meaningful consultation was followed." The two departments in the College of Social Sciences (CoSS): are Environmental Studies (ENVS) and Urban & Regional Planning (URBP). I would like to thank the participants at the hearing, which included the Provost and Senator, Vincent Del Casino; CoSS Dean, Anne Marie Todd; ENVS & URBP Chairs, Katherine Cushing and Bill Lester; and numerous members from both

departments, for presenting their views without rancor and in the spirit of shared governance. OG is preparing a written report that will come later.

Finally, I must acknowledge that tomorrow there is a General Election in the United States. I encourage you to do your duty and vote if you are a citizen. 23 percent of Californians already have. This is a historic election. No matter the outcome or the outcomes, there will be many heightened emotions. I want to share some information with you about SJSU's options to access support for you and your students. [sjsu/elections](#) post elections on support on the days following. If you are interested in volunteering on those days you can contact me. I have been searching for the right words of wisdom for two weeks to end this update. In the process, I was also doing my routine Senate Chair work and that was in the end what gave me perspective, as I looked at the old policies that had the names of senators from the past. November 6, 2024, is one day. It may be a day that is seared forever in our memories. December 9, and today are days when we discuss policies and clauses and the placement of commas in those clauses. They may seem surreal. Still, my plea is: policies and the sincere effort of those who wrote them may be the only thing that stand between us and chaos.

Questions

Q: Thank you for mentioning the post-election resources. I was talking with my students this morning, and I did not know where to send them. Could we get a university-wide announcement on that page about a place to turn to, for any stresses that students specifically are feeling?

B. From the President:

I am sharing the updated institutional core values that we spent the last academic year working on, which were adopted in April of 2024 and really institutionalized over the summer. The priorities of the institution are those over which I am hovering, and by no means do they suggest every strategic goal or initiative that's occurring across the university. But within that template, I have presented a series of items I will be presenting on every month, which is related to the five core priorities. The priorities align directly with our Transformation 2030 strategic plan. Holistic student engagement is at the core and center of what we do. This month, between October and November, we participated in the year of engagement at California State University.

We took a team of eight people to the day-and-a-half presentation on Graduation Initiative (GI), in which I participated actively along with the Provost and other senators here in the room. From that, we will be participating in planning around closing our equity gaps. This work will continue to accelerate. I sent a message recently referring to the next part of that, the California State University Strategic Plan. This is a document, an opportunity to participate in the CSU Strategic Plan, in which the year of engagement is embedded. That link, which went out in an email last week, will invite you to an open town hall conducted by the CSU. Not to be confused with Transformation 2030. It's been a very busy month, as it tends to be in the academy. We launched the Honorary Doctorate committee, which the interim Vice President is chairing, Marc

d'Alarcao. That committee came with recommendations from the executive committee, and that work is underway. We've had many traditional student activities in the last couple of weeks, including our homecoming block party, Fire on the Foundation, and yesterday's annual breakfast at the International House. If you have not yet had a chance to visit International House and the upgrades that have occurred in the facility, I encourage you to do that.

Enrollment growth is another theme within holistic student engagement. One of our focuses this year is to continue growing, achieving our enrollment target, and identifying new markets. We have been strengthening the relationships that we have with community colleges. The Provost, myself, the senior AVPs, and others have been visiting our community colleges. We were at Foothill College and Mission College last month, and we have several other visits scheduled with all eight of the community colleges in Santa Clara County as well. Then, we'll move into other neighboring counties to continue our work. The focus areas are admissions, concurrent enrollment, and dual admit programs through the new TSP (Transfer Success Plan) initiative. We are working closely with high schools that are working directly with community colleges, so this is all about building pipelines.

About a week ago, we had the fabulous African-American College Readiness Summit. This initiative was launched a couple of years ago. It is in person, and anyone can come, but the focus is on African-American and Black student success. We had about 500 students from within the county participate. It's sponsored by the Santa Clara County Office of Education, at which we are a co-sponsor and co-host. It's about encouraging students to see themselves here at San Jose State. Also, it had a very rich discussion with several of our existing students who are here, and leaders within our community. We will do the same program for middle school students in the spring. This is First Generation week, and earlier today, I was at a panel discussion with about eight of our first-gen students who are also participants in TRIO and EOP. Just this last Saturday, we had preview day. We had over 2000 students and their families participate in preview day. These are all focused on enrollment growth. Also, we focused on our well-being collective and had several significant opportunities to celebrate well-being and well-being at SJSU, promoting student health, mental health, and basic needs. We opened the prayer space in late September for Muslim students, faculty, and staff. It was a very well-attended event, and I received many messages from community members appreciating that prayer space. On November 19th, we will have an upcoming campus climate community forum at the MLK Library.

Regarding the question on resources, we sent a message earlier in October showcasing some of the resources available for our student body and faculty and staff community. The Provost will send another message this afternoon, giving you another link to those resources. Dr. Dukes also sent out a message last week that pointed to resources related to ODEI and several initiatives happening around the community. We all recognize it's a period of uneasiness. I'll be sending another message tomorrow, on Election Day, to remind people where our polling site is. We'll also refer to resources that are available and how to think about opportunities to mitigate uncertainty or uneasiness that may exist in someone's life. We had a number of celebratory events, most impactful, the Legacy Month events, which we celebrated on the eighth and the 16th. The City Council and Mayor Matt Mahan did declare October 16th Smith and Carlos Day, 56 years after their victory stance on the Olympics stage. It was an opportunity

for all of us to think through how we frame engagement, peaceful protest, activating voices, and the like, which has always been a significant part of our DNA here. We also had a state of election security forum- critical to the conversation we have been talking about- with one of our assembly representatives and the assistant registrar for the county voters. I moderated the event, which was fascinating and hosted by SJSU Votes. They have been doing many activities this semester leading up to the election. We also had the Don Edwards lecture, where the soon-to-be former supervisor and Spartan alumna, Cindy Chavez, was the keynote speaker alongside a fireside chat. There were several students there talking to our elected officials. A local journalist moderated it, and it was about the current state of political affairs in our state and community. Additionally, SJSU continues to entertain visitors, as we had the U.S. ambassador to Malaysia stop and visit.

Academic excellence, achievement, and WASC accreditation are also on our priority list. The Digital Humanities Center opened in the Martin Luther King Library. There was a grand opening event, and already hosting a number of activities, including its first lecture series on data feminism. On October 9th, at the University Leadership Council, we had a pretty in-depth discussion about the methodologies used in rankings as we consider our emergence to R2 as a national university. Marc d'Alarcao is leading that campus community conversation and has a very thoughtful and thorough presentation that he shared with all of us, and more work to come from that. We also spent some time there talking about where we are in the process of our accreditation, which will remain critical as we continue to work in preparing the documents that will be submitted in January. Dr Dukes has presented many times on the Inclusive Excellence Model. She's also taken feedback on the Interfaith Task Force that will soon launch. We have tentatively scheduled an inclusive excellence framework town hall on November 13th.

We've launched a new initiative I've called People-Centered Excellence. It is focused on removing redundancies and administrative barriers so that our employees can improve their job experience here at San Jose State. People-Centered Excellence also tackles a large number of issues and opportunities around diversity, equity, and inclusion in the culture that we create together as a community around our values. As a pilot to the entire CSU, San Jose State is working with Deloitte in the Multi-Campus Collaborative to pilot this new initiative around streamlining administrative processes in our university

We've had a lot of conversations about building a financially sustainable budget model over the last couple of years. At the previous meeting, we had a presentation on the budget and a full town hall. The Provost also has a budget presentation pending for the Office of Academic Affairs. Chancellor Garcia has issued the budget memo for the entire CSU with the planning guidelines for the next fiscal year. As we think about the business of running the university, we have spent a lot of time planning for all kinds of scenarios that are important to keep our campus healthy and safe as we move forward to the next few weeks, through the election cycle and any other issues that may arise in our campus community.

When I first came to SJSU, one of the most common soundbites I heard from faculty was the conditions of our classrooms. So, through the IT department, under Bob Lim's leadership, we have engaged with Deloitte to assess our classroom technology to help us put together both the current state and future state for upgrading our classrooms. That work is ongoing, and we'll return to the executive committee and, when ready, to the Academic Senate, as well as looking

at the integration of other technologies on campus, including our security cameras, which were presented to the executive committee just last week.

Questions:

C: Can you give us an update on the incident in February?

A: The interviews are ongoing. I have seen a working draft that simply outlines the pattern of all the various inputs that occurred around that incident. I have asked for the completed report before Thanksgiving on the fact patterns and the incident itself. An executive summary will be prepared, which I can share with the Senate and other members of the campus community. The delay has been due to the difficulty in scheduling all the needed interviews, but that work is now done. Everyone has been interviewed by a third-party law firm.

Q: Post-election resources are important, but there is also the potential for violence. So, what is your contingency plan for the university community should there be riots and violence?

A: Several members of our leadership team, along with the Chief of Police, have been working with the city of San Jose on emergency planning and tabletop exercises and activities. Also, at our cabinet level, we have been engaged in tabletop exercises. We are very connected with our local and regional law enforcement officials. We will be appropriately informed if there is an undercurrent that would suggest violence or protest, etc., so that we can be actively prepared. We have a number of individuals within our leadership team who are also working most diligently with our time, place, and manner policy to support appropriate freedom of expression and protests that fall within our TPM guidelines. We are working diligently on all fronts. We are ready, if necessary, to activate our Emergency Operations Center, and that group of individuals that are part of the time, place, and manner, as well as the broader citywide community groups, are in close connection on a minute-by-minute, hour-by-hour basis.

C (Senator Fuentes-Martin): I am San Jose State's DUO leader for Time, Place, and Manner. The emergency operations center on campus coordinates extensively with the City of San Jose. Additionally, on Instagram, students have been marketed about Election Day voting inside the campus and the hours. There is also a game plan for student support on Election Day and post-election. There will be an informal speech area at the Smith and Carlos statue from 11 - 7. Also, there will be listening stations for the rest of this week, where students can go to have a dialog with others about the election results. Those areas include University Housing, the Student Wellness Center, the Political Science Department, and throughout the Student Union. There are two websites: SJSU votes led by Mary Currin-Percivall and SJSU post-election for safety, student wellness and well-being. I am part of the Election Volunteers headquarters for tomorrow. There are several things I am hoping will be visible tomorrow and available to students, as well as following what's happening on Instagram for TPM so if it does elevate to a level of concern, we are ready to respond as well.

Q: What is happening with the reorganization of student affairs?

A: I will let Senator Fuentes-Martin respond, but there are several moving parts and pieces to support better student success: our focus on holistic student engagement and the year of engagement. The intent is to expand the services we're offering to students everywhere that are important to create alignment for the point of entry, which is at orientation, to persistence, retention, and time to degree. There is more demand for student support services as we

continue to grow and a further emphasis on honing in on how vital student success is, and how we deliver those services at scale.

C(Senator Fuentes-Martin): When Sonja Daniels left in the summer, I took that opportunity to redesign that position, and we made an Associate Vice President and Dean of Students. I think this role is critical to an institution the size of SJSU to focus on leadership development, academic partnerships, risk management, conduct and compliance, and things in that category. Part of this comes from my experience as an Associate VP Dean of Students at other campuses. Time Place and Manner were really big last year, and I think a Dean of Students would have taken on that responsibility differently. We could have had a better game plan. It felt that we experienced many things in spring that could have been handled differently. We have worked diligently on that work, but finding the right executive leader in Student Affairs who can play the role of dean of students is challenging. I have also taken this time to become more familiar with the Student Union and Associated Students. Being from Texas, we don't have those concepts there, and I have learned a lot from those two entities. I am a big proponent of students' empowerment to run 501(c)(3)s and help guide resources for services they want to see more of. I have also taken responsibility for University Housing, which generates 55 million dollars in revenue. We have added 700 hundred more beds with the potential for more. I also moved the International House from Academic Affairs to Student Affairs, which has about five departments. This is an ongoing project, and we are working to create a better sense of place and maintain the gift it was originally meant to be.

One of the reasons I work in higher education is to help underrepresented students access and succeed in college. So, I have transitioned from AVP for Student Success to VP for Equity and Belonging. I am trying to focus on our nine cultural centers, TRIO Guardian scholars, and our EOP departments to work diligently and collaboratively on how to move the needle for student equity and improve a sense of belonging. I believe students are not completely satisfied right now, and the landscape of the United States has changed. The diversity in San Jose is unique and special, and I don't know if we are meeting the needs of the students. I did have an external consultant who worked with us over the summer. She interviewed all of the people who were involved, as well as the three AVPs that they all reported to. We have now aligned all of those units, and the plan is to have an AVP who is a DEI expert who can help us with retention, student success, and improving our sense of belonging for all the groups.

C: Additionally, there are no new positions; they are just realigning existing ones. If desired, we can also bring this item back and add it to the agenda to show work charts and such.

Q: Is there any specific guidance for the faculty re elections? We have classes for the rest of the week. Also, is there any faculty support? I know some of my colleagues are quite stressed out as well.

A: (Provost): The message at 4 today will include all the resources for faculty. The challenge we face is trying to compile a message for everyone, since some people are well prepared and have background knowledge to talk about these things, and others don't. We will have to play it by ear on some things, but not all faculty are expected to be political scientists, and we gave some ideas for things in the classroom if you wanted to do something.

C: If you want to volunteer and interact with students, let me know, and I will connect you with the people running those programs.

V. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

Executive Committee Minutes of September 23, 2024- no questions

Executive Committee Minutes of October 7, 2024- no questions

Executive Committee Minutes of October 21, 2024 - no questions

B. Election Calendar- approved unanimously.

Q: Will there be a delay because of amendments we are passing to change the Constitution?

A: No

C. Consent Calendar- Consent Calendar for November 4, 2024

D. Executive Committee Action Items:

Committee on Senate Representation:

AS 1876 Amendment to the Constitution of the Academic Senate of San José State University (Final Reading)

The chair recognized Senator Peter.

C: Last time, we unanimously passed the amendments to the Constitution and unanimously passed the changes to the bylaws. Subsequently, the special committee discovered there was an error in oversight. That error would disenfranchise our Student Service Professionals, not for the purpose of voting or representation of the Senate but for voting on referendums and constitutional amendments. We need to fix this today to pass this in time and send the amendment out for voting. To do this, we must reconsider the passage of the constitutional amendment, and then we must amend it.

Senator Kataoka moved to reconsider AS 1876, which Senator Gambarin seconded. This motion was friendly to the body.

Senator Kataoka moved to amendment AS 1876, which was seconded by Senator Curry.

C: the language here was borrowed from the other places in the Constitution where it was eliminated. This is simply to restore the status quo and allow our SSP senators to vote on

constitutional amendments and referendums.

C: We want to include our non-faculty senators in the electorate, and this is a no-brainer.

The Kataoka amendment was approved unanimously.

AS 1877 Amendment to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate of San José State University (Final Reading)

Senator Kataoka moved to reconsider AS 1877, which was seconded by Senator Gambarin. This motion was friendly to the body.

C: The language in the Constitution is more general and does not define who exactly has voting rights on the constitutional amendments; that language needs to be amended in the bylaws.

This motion was friendly to the body.

Senator Kaufman moved to amend 1877, which was seconded by Senator Nwokolo.

C: The language here is very similar and, in some cases, identical to the language used to identify SSP service professionals.

The Kaufman amendment was approved unanimously.

I. Unfinished Business: None

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

A. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

Senator Riley presented AS 1879 Amendment N to University Policy S15-7 University Policy, Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Procedures (First Reading)

This is around departments' RPT guidelines and is a first reading, so I am looking for feedback to bring back to the committee.

Questions:

Q: I have a question about section 4.1.2. Why was this put in place? Why can't the department decide to make guidelines because it feels that it needs to explain itself rather than go through the pre-authorization process?

A: The purpose was not to gatekeep. We have found that most departments have worked on these guidelines for a long time, and then they don't meet the requirements, so it comes to Professional Standards and the Provost Office, and we provide feedback and never see it again. This is all spelled out in the rationale. A simple questionnaire

would help us really determine and help the department with clarification rather than just creating a document that repeats a policy, which is also dangerous because you don't want this policy to circulate.

C: This issue is that those departments want those guidelines. So when you're saying you may not be authorized to have guidelines, it kind of diminishes the agency that department and faculty might feel in having control over some aspect of explaining their professional lives. So, just think about considering instead of pre-authorization, providing better training to departments to develop guidelines instead of going through a pre-authorization process. Faculty want to explain their professional discipline to people outside of their development. Also, does it have to be approved by both PS and the Provost's office?

A: We have a member of the Provost Office on the committee.

C: Yes, but the policy said "and" for "both."

A: It is not our intention to have to do it twice.

Q: 4.2.5 was never clear to us who exactly the audience was.

A: The RTP guidelines were never intended for the departments' use. They were always meant as an external tool for other levels of review. They were not meant for tenure-track faculty or anything like that to use them, although obviously, that has happened.

C: I think some extra emphasis on that throughout the document would help secure that notion. 4.2.6—Is that something that is monitored or measured?

A: Professional standards would look for that in the guidelines that are being submitted. We would work with the department to ensure that the RTP guidelines do not create additional barriers.

C: Does PS go back and check if there is equity between everyone?

A: No, we will wait to be alerted.

C: I think it's worth the conversation whether or not department guidelines are helpful. I've seen in some contexts that faculty don't meet the standards set out by the departments, or departments don't hold someone to those standards, but it gets to my level, and I'm at some level obligated to hold them to those standards because they were written down and given to me as the department's expectations for tenure promotion. So if you want flexibility across the three categories, if you want flexibility concerning scholarship, engagement, and so forth, there are a couple of places like the Library and Counseling that are obvious where you have to have something because they're different; however, I'm not convinced in the academic areas that they are as valuable. It could be that colleges could do some of this work with statements of overall expectation. 98% of the time, the debate is in RSCA. To Senator Riley's point a ton of work is coming in to not benefit people.

C: I think the biggest problem we would face right now is considering reforming the RTP guidelines to be equitable so that they are not a labor pit and don't simply repeat university policy. The biggest elephant in the room is the department's attachments to something that they think is about representing them. That is what I need your help with. How do we separate them?

The questions section will continue at the next senate meeting.

Senator Riley presented AS 1870 Board of Professional Responsibility to rescind S99-9 University Policy, Board of Professional Responsibility (Final Reading)

The Senate passed this policy in May of last year, but it was returned to Professional Standards for some additional work. I sent out a document explaining how we modified it. Most of the work was structural.

Questions:

C: Since the administration returned this, can you tell us whether you had some feedback that this version is acceptable?

A: We had been collaborating with Joanne (Wright) before the May voting, but this semester, I have been very pleased with the collaborative effect and good faith that both Joanne and Vin (del Casino) have shown in restructuring the policy. This work was not only exemplary of what we hope the Board of Professional Responsibility will be able to do with administration collaboratively, but I think that the creation of this policy was an example of that.

C: This was sent back mainly because of the order in which things operated. It was very confusing how things would enter in because we have Title IX and other things like that now, where things need to go first. It came back to give clarity because we didn't want the board to be the place that suddenly, by accident, received something that really should be in another office and handled administratively, given the legal changes that have come since the policy.

Debate

C: I was one of the people who nitpicked this last year, and now we have senior lecturers who can now be candidates to join the board, and it is a clear policy done collectively.

AS 1870 was approved 39-0-0

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

Senator Masegian presented AS 1880 Amendment A to University Policy S12-1, Faculty Office Hours (First Reading)

This is a first reading, so I wanted to share with you the changes we made in committee and questions that we're considering so that we can get feedback from you on these specific things that we already know we want feedback on. First, after a lengthy debate, we took the word schedule out of office hours. We wanted to try to find a balance between reasonable accessibility to the students outside of class as opposed to what must take place during these specific times. In committee, we consider having office hours with sign-up times so you can choose to do other things during those times if no students sign up. We welcome feedback on this. Secondly, we separated instructional assignments vs non-instructional assignments. We

wanted to clarify that office hours might not look the same for instructional assignments versus non-instructional assignments. Lastly, we were considering whether or not to include language on departmental review recommendations because there are parts of that policy that speak to department policies that might differ from this.

Questions:

Q: I just want to suggest that if you remove the schedule, it is consistent throughout the document. You said that we may be required to have office hours for non-instructional assignments, such as advising. So, I'm wondering if there is any clarity that you could provide on who is requiring these non-instructional office hours. This seems like a new thing to me. I wonder if it might be better to leave it more general than saying things like advising. This expectation that we will be required to have all of those hours to do stuff that we're not supposed to be doing at all may be ...

Q: How do the students on the committee feel about striking our schedule?

A: I only speak for myself, not all students. I know I have had classes with office hours that fall right before them, but I am in another class, so I either miss my class or do not get the help. Having some language that faculty can use outside office hours is important because students aren't always available during those times.

C: I understand that. There are good reasons why faculty have scheduled hours; students may want those hours because they can know when they are available. I'm also concerned that this might open the door to pressure on faculty to have more than two hours.

Q: Section 1 E- Does this apply to each department's voting rights issues? If this is the case, there may be a slight chance that lectures may not be included.

A: That is why we updated the reference to current policies, which include voting rights, which should include lecturer faculty.

Q: The policy seems to indicate that departments do not have to follow this if they don't want to.

A: The departments can't override it; they can make additional guidelines regarding the announcement of office hours.

The questions section will continue at the next senate meeting.

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

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

Senator Frazier presented AS 1874, University Policy, Organization of the Academic Planning Process at San Jose State University (Final Reading)

AS 1874 is mostly a culmination of almost two years' worth of work by the program planning committee, which is a committee to be renamed if this resolution passes to the academic planning committee. The essence of the proposal is the revisions of the program review process to modernize it to include elements that haven't yet been part of existing policy but have become important to the university. It also makes official a few current practices that weren't covered in 2017, the last time we did the policy. The process is being renamed academic planning rather than program planning, as that's a more accurate term for what it is. With the university's increased focus on RSCA these past years, a RSCA focus has been added to the process. The description of the membership of the renamed Academic Planning Committee has been slightly modified and simplified by O&G. Section six of the existing policy is being stricken because it's all about process, and the process is now detailed fully in the accompanying guidelines. Also, section seven is being stricken because it's all about GE assessment reporting, and that's already adequately covered in our GE policies. One of the sticking points during the meetings was how to handle the action plan meeting. Currently, Program Planning Committee (PPC) prepares the agenda, but it feels that departments know much better how to set an agenda for such meetings. The PPC has determined over time that they don't feel qualified to judge what a department should or should not want to talk about at the action plan meeting. CSR found this reasonable, and we consulted with department chairs, who were overwhelmingly in favor of that idea. The current program planning committee also wants to implement this during the current cycle, if possible.

Questions:

C: This policy does not appear to mention an optional college meeting strategy.

A: There's a stage where you're setting the agenda for the action plan. Part of that might involve having a separate meeting at the college level, and that's what PPC had initially wanted to require that meeting at the college level, but we pushed back on that. We agreed that if so desired, departments or colleges could have that meeting if they wanted to.

Q: In the section on membership, it is the vice provost designated. Is this any vice provost? Does the provost designate this? Also, there used to be release time or a stipend given to individuals to complete the self-study because it was such a time-intensive process. Is that no longer available?

A: It's all gone, yes. Over the years, program planning has been associated with different offices. The principle involved has changed, so the idea was to keep the title relatively unspecific so that changes in the future can be made.

Q: Can you explain how the three categories for the members do not overlap?

A: There are no GU people who overlap in academic colleges. To my understanding, the GU are librarians and counselors.

C: The GU does include faculty from smaller colleges.

Debate

Senator Mathur proposed an amendment to AS 1874.

Mathur Amendment on line 123 removes “Vice Provost (Designated)” and replaces it with “provost designee.”

The Mathur Amendment was friendly to the body.

Kataoka Amendment on line 128 adds “of the represented” before academic colleges.

The Kataoka Amendment was seconded.

C: This is the common practice in other policies and prevents someone from being able to represent two different groups.

C: If we are going off of the constitution, then we should do so as per the Senate constitution.

Senator Del Casino proposed an amendment to the Kataoka Amendment to add “per the Senate constitution,” which was friendly to the body.

The Kataoka Amendment passed with the Del Casino Amendment to the Kataoka Amendment 36-0-0

AS 1874 passed 39-0-0

E. University Library Board (ULB):

III. Special Committee Reports:

IV. New Business:

Senator Pinnell and Senator Buyco presented AS 1881, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Concerning the Interim CSU Time, Place and Manner (TPM) Policy and Connected Chancellor’s Directive, the Process of Its Creation and the Implications of the Policy for Campus Operations and Freedom of Expression for Faculty, Student Staff, and Unions on the SJSU Campus (First Reading)

A Sense of the Senate is an opinion of the body; it is not meant to be an action item. It is meant to show the Senate's view on things that have happened, or may happen. In this case, it has to do with the interim TPM. This policy was passed in haste. It was passed in haste because of a legislative bill that was issued that required the passage of an interim policy. This policy was not given sufficient time with the ASCSU. It was not given sufficient time for review with the California State Students Association (CSSA), nor was it given sufficient time with the unions. It was then sent to the various campuses, with only a few days to develop an addendum to implement this policy. So SJSU was forced to come up, in a couple of days, with the various environments where this would be implemented. They came up with three types: public, private,

and limited. The most limited environments are the classrooms and the academic buildings. If you've looked at the resolution, there are many footnotes. The reason for the footnotes is that I brought this around to my colleagues, and they asked what happened and what the difference is here. If you look at the policy that has been in place for some time and was put out by the President on January 1st, 2024, it is an incredibly detailed policy. It has times, places, and matters for posting, tabling, student organizations or events, and speakers. Pretty much anything under the sun is covered in such detail that there's no room for interpretation. The interim policy, on the other hand, was clearly done for a different purpose. It was done to lean toward campus security because, before the summer, we had protests on campus and encampments. As a result, the changes are meant to prevent that as much as possible while trying to balance it out with academic freedom. The interim policy is very vague. Some examples of when this could be a problem are in February when we had an event that was meant to be public and was moved into a classroom.

This could get a member of the academia on this campus in trouble because that would now be an event that was suddenly moved into a limited environment. We have had faculty on other campuses report that they are afraid to store supplies in their offices because that could be considered camping. We have had faculty on this campus who are afraid to teach various classes because they're afraid to send their students out to do various activities, and they may not be able to work on this campus and do it. The students are also up in arms in many ways because they do not know the full details of this policy, and there's just enough vagueness that this could be construed badly, given the wrong circumstances. This is not the only resolution that has been issued. Other campuses have done it, but this is by far the most detailed one because my colleagues wanted the information. The interim policy will not be there forever, but it will be there long enough to potentially get us in trouble.

We sent the draft to as many people as possible, including Senators Del Casino and Faas. We received some very good feedback, as well as some feedback from Senator Rodan. We want this to be a broadly accepted resolution; it is not meant to be one-sided. This is a senate resolution to bring us all together and find common ground where free speech can happen.

Questions

Q: What is the relationship between the presidential directive and the interim policy? Does the interim policy disappear completely, or can we keep both? If there's a contradiction between our campus-based policy and the interim policy, I presume the system policy takes precedence, but what happens to the relationship between these two different directives?

A: (President) The CSU interim policy is overarching to the SJSU campus policy, which is attached to the CSU policy as an interim status. So, our existing policy did make some modifications, but it is attached as an addendum. I cannot answer what happens if they're in conflict. I don't believe that they're in conflict now in the way that they're articulated.

A: If you look at the policy issued on January 1st, which is the policy in place before the interim policy, it is very clear what hours you can do things like tabling and posting. The limited environment that applies to academic buildings means student access is from 7 a.m. to 10:30

p.m., Monday through Saturday. So, it is a more blanket policy that applies to all academic buildings. If students have study groups, do lab work, etc., that go past 10:30 p.m., and there is no faculty supervision, there may be concerns for the students in that case. This is clearly meant to keep students out of the academic building after 10:30 pm. We don't want students camping or taking over buildings. So, that could conflict with the current campus policy.

C: In your introduction, you mentioned the incident that happened in February. You're right that it is problematic. The move (to my understanding) to change the designation from a public event to a classroom activity was at the request of administrators and, certainly, the chief of police, who was concerned as a public event, there were significant safety concerns. Moving the event back into the classroom where it had been scheduled initially seemed to make perfect sense to me from a safety perspective. There are issues with the Chancellor's Office interim policy regarding the vagueness of the language in some cases. I sense that the escalation of protests on some campuses around the system led to the legislature enacting a clearer TPM policy. I believe they avoided our campus because of the President's clear articulation of what a TPM policy should be. We avoided getting into the mess that other campuses had to endure because we already had the policy the President put into place. Therefore, given the vagueness of the Chancellor's system-wide TPM policy, the holes will be filled with the articulate language of the President's policy. I completely endorse your call for consultation and shared governance.

C: Senator Lessow-Hurley told me she supports this resolution but that the first resolve clause reads like a whereas clause, so you may want to change the language there.

C: Would you agree that this should probably not be a final reading since there are suggested changes you have received?

A: I am willing to bring this one back with people's feedback. Since we are pressed for time, you might need to email me your changes. I am willing to bring this back on December 9th. I just want this to be an option that we can agree on because it is an option for the body.

C: Is there a reason why it would be beneficial to bring this as a final reading now with the election tomorrow?

A: We could look at this as a statement that we do not want to make a decision in haste or knee-jerk decisions with campus security in mind.

C: I think we need to be careful with this one. I want to get the language just right. For tomorrow's election, I recommend that many more of us sign up on that sheet sent out by John Tucker's office to volunteer to give folks support for this election. I think that's what we need to do: give our students and each other support, regardless of what happens in this election. The whole spirit of this is not to rush through it.

C: Number three and number seven are essentially the same.

V. State of the University Announcements:

A. Vice President for Student Affairs: Not present

B. Chief Diversity Officer

Reminder for the Inclusive Excellence town hall, which is open to the whole community on Wednesday, November 13th, 10-12 in Student Union room 3A. This will be the official launch of the Inclusive Excellence Framework for the campus community. It is timed to coincide with Transforming Communities. The campus climate community forum will be on November 19th, 11 am - 1 pm. This community forum is designed for students. It is an opportunity for faculty, staff, and administrators to be active listeners, hear the concerns of our students, and hear their suggestions on ways to move forward. Both these events are sponsored by CCDEI. This will be an opportunity to talk about the recent graffiti incidents that we've had across campus. I am very disheartened to report that we had another incident last weekend. It is completely unacceptable for racial slurs to be written anywhere on this campus, and we must stay vigilant. Even if we do not catch the assailant, we can control how we react. So, if we can lean in on these moments, be supportive of one another, and truly be a community of mutual care, that is what we need to be.

Q: We are in First Generation College Student Week and I just wanted to know the definition of first generation college student since there are different definitions out there. We used to have a website or the CSU did. There are international students who have parents who went to college in a different country and might view themselves as first generation. So is there a discussion during this week what first generation is?

A: I will take your question back to EOP.

C. Associated Students President

We had an amazing legacy month all of last month with some notable events, such as our keynote from Dr. Angela Davis on campus. On October 16th, we had our day of action and ceremony with notable speaker Assemblymembers, Santa Clara County Supervisor Cindy Chavez and Tommy Smith. Both Tommy Smith and John Carlos visited our campus, which made our students think about the passionate history of student activism that we have at SJSU. AS recently endorsed AS 1876 to expand the Senate. CSR came and presented to AS. We also passed a resolution in support of the Muwekma Ohlone Tribe Trail of Truth mission for federal recognition. This is for federal recognition for all federally unrecognized tribes in the US, not just the Muwekma. We will be bringing an SoS related to this to the December meeting. The tribe arrived in Washington, DC, but was arrested. We also hosted our first monthly town hall on October 30th. Some priority topics were affordability for students and the TPM policies. Our next one will be November 19th. AS also published a resolution in support of the Filipino-American history mural, which we're still making progress on. We're hopefully going to start looking at two different artists and releasing the RFP sometime soon. We also donated \$10,000 for the creation of the mural. Lastly, we will be releasing some legislation soon opposing Governor Newsom's veto of AB 2586, which would give equal opportunities to students for all campus jobs, regardless of immigration status. We are mainly thinking about undocumented students when opposing this because it primarily affects them. We also support the Basic Assistance for Students in College Act and drafting a resolution in support of teacher

recruitment and retention by supporting different legislation, such as Senate Bill 995, which aims to address the teacher shortage by restructuring the teacher credentialing process and creating a more streamlined four-year model, which allows students to earn their bachelor's and a teaching credential in one integrated program. If AB 995 does get passed, it will be piloted at three CSU campuses. Please remember to try to interact with your students as much as possible.

D. CSU Statewide Representative

The ASCSU policy committees will take place next week from November 13-15th. Thank you, Senator Rodan, for reminding you all to send your comments for the ASCSU TPM redlining policy. I sent that to Senator Pinnell and Buyco with a long list of comments on the policy they submitted today. I sent the links for the three policies for which they asked for feedback. We have been filling seats for committees, including faculty discipline review groups. There has been some larger discussion at the ASCSU around the UC area H, which is a requirement for ethnic studies.

E. Provost

I am having a budget town hall meeting on Wednesday, which will be an extended version of my presentation here with more time for questions. I did this in the Spring of 2023. I expect 40 minutes of presentation and 50 minutes of questions. We are really digging into the WASC midterm report. WASC has a dashboard for every institution. On our eight-year outcome, we are 12% ahead of the national average on graduation rate and 10% ahead of our WASC peers. We've been within the 50th and the 75th percentile on every measure that WASC puts out, including student debt on leaving school, which is \$5,000 to \$6,000 below the national average.

F. Vice President for Administration and Finance- Not present

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