Executive Committee Minutes
March 14, 2022
via Zoom, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Present: Karthika Sasikumar (Acting Chair), Brandon White,
               Julia Curry, Ravisha Mathur, Vincent Del Casino, Patrick Day,
               Tabitha Hart, Stefan Frazier, Kathleen Wong(Lau),
               Winifred Schultz-Krohn, Charlie Faas,

Absent: Kimb Massey, Anoop Kaur, Steve Perez

1. There was no dissent to approval of the agenda and Consent Calendar (Executive Committee Agenda of March 14, 2022, Consent Calendar of March 14, 2022) (11-0-0).

2. The Executive Committee approved the minutes of February 21, 2022 (11-0-0).

3. The Executive Committee discussed the Appointments Calendar for 2022. The committee suggested notifying the chairs and deans about vacancies over the summer before the seats go at large. The committee approved the Appointments Calendar for 2022 (11-0-0).

4. The Executive Committee approved the Elections Calendar for 2023 (11-0-0).

5. The Executive Committee discussed the Senate Calendar for 2022-2023.   Several minor editorial corrections were suggested. The committee approved the Senate Calendar for 2022-2023 as edited (11-0-0).

6. The Executive Committee discussed the possibility of returning to in-person Executive Committee meetings after Spring break. Chair Sasikumar will work with Melanie Schlitzkus to obtain a suitable conference room.

7. Updates from the policy committees:
    a. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
        O&G is working on a referral regarding remote attendance at Senate, Executive Committee, and Policy Committee meetings, which is covered under Standing Rule 17g.

        The committee was asked for its opinion regarding the meeting attendance referral. Several comments were made about the difficulty in having hybrid (simultaneous online and in-person) Senate meetings given the lack of technology in the current meeting room used by the Senate. Discussion included concerns locating a different meeting room large enough for the Senate and guests to all attend that can be routinely used (a room not being used for classes). The Committee discussed the difficulty in running a Senate meeting

remotely and the extreme difficulty there would be in conducting a hybrid Senate meeting for the Chair and Associate Vice Chair (AVC).

When this question was raised at the Senate Retreat, Senators either strongly supported in-person meetings or strongly supported online meetings. Many Senators spoke about wanting to be in the same room and talk to each other during debate. Several Senators said it was much easier to hear in zoom meetings, whereas when in Engr. 285/287 the wireless microphones sometimes don't work. One interesting thing noted by some Senators was they thought there was a kind of hierarchy of those seated closest to the Senate Chair. Those Senators who came in late for the meeting were forced to sit in the back when attending the in-person Senate meetings. Several Senators expressed concern there could be differential treatment between those Senators attending in-person and those online if a hybrid model was used. Some members expressed strong opposition to remote attendance at Senate meetings, because they felt it very important that Senators be present in person. Some members felt that allowing the Senate Chair to determine the meeting modality of the Senate and Executive Committee meetings was giving too much power to the Senate Chair. The consensus was that now is not the appropriate time to have hybrid Senate meetings, but it should be revisited in the near future when a meeting room with appropriate technology may be available to the Senate.

O&G is considering letting the Senate Chair determine the modality of the Executive Committee meetings in consultation with the Executive Committee. For the Senate meetings, the expectation is that meetings should be in person, but the Chair should have the flexibility to change the meeting to online if needed. For policy committee meetings, the consensus was that policy committees should determine their own modality in consultation with committee members.

b. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
PS will be bringing an RTP policy amendment regarding scholarly and artistic achievement to the March 21, 2022 Senate meeting. PS is also working on a template for departments to use for RTP guidelines. PS will probably have an amendment for the RTP policy regarding academic assignment at the April 18th Senate meeting.

Questions:
Q: Do you have an estimate of the percentage of departments that have a template for these guidelines already?
A: No. It varies across colleges. With some colleges, it's almost every department that has approved Department RTP Guidelines, and in other colleges there are not as many. The structure is so different between departments and colleges and you are looking at such diversity in terms of how these guidelines are constructed with some guidelines providing a table and other guidelines being several pages of dense text. The RTP committee may have to sort

through 18 pages of a Department RTP Guideline to find examples about service and academic assignment, etc.

Q: What is the enforceability of guidelines? Can they be used in grievance processes?
A: PS can't enforce. The RTP training process highlighted the use of department guidelines. The department guidelines are supposed to provide examples and clarity about how the dossier evaluation is conducted at various levels. Some of the guidelines are nicely written and clearly guide you to where you can find evidence of certain things in the dossier. This is what we'd like for a template.
C: It would be worth finding out who can enforce the guidelines, because if candidates are following the guidelines in lieu of using university policy, we need to be very clear in the training.
C: A member commented that the downside to a template is that it eliminates the individual department's uniqueness with a plug and play model. It imposes an institutional character on the process that doesn't allow departments to celebrate their uniqueness.
C: A member expressed concern about the use of the word "enforceability" and the term "in lieu of." There should never be a conflict between the guidelines and RTP policy. The guidelines are there to enhance and elaborate on existing RTP policy. The question of enforceability should never even come into play with the guidelines, because the guidelines are not meant to supersede the RTP current policy.
A: That is exactly the point of the guidelines. The guidelines provide examples due to the uniqueness and diversity we have in various disciplines across campus.
Q: The RTP Policy always trumps the guidelines. The guidelines are like administrative regulations. Is this correct?
C: There is a clause in the RTP policy that states department RTP guidelines must be applied when evaluating the dossier, so it isn't just policy people are supposed to be looking at. If guidelines exist, they must look at them.
A: PS is just trying to make it a little more consistent so people can find the data.
Q: A member expressed concern about how these guidelines are evaluated in terms of their consistency with RTP policy.
A: Professional standards reviews submitted department RTP Guidelines to assess the consistency with the SJSU RTP Policy.

c. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
I&SA will bring a first reading of the Add/Drop Policy to the Senate next week. Currently students may drop up until day nine in the semester, and may add until day 14. The current proposal is to change the deadlines for both to the same day which is the day before census, or day 19.

3

The second thing I&SA will bring to the Senate next week for a first reading is a revision to a 1972 policy on Emergency Short Term Loans for Students. The Bursar's Office does give these out about two to three times a year. Since it was passed in 1972, there are procedural changes.

d. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
C&R will be continuing to look at curriculum such as the BS in Data Science today.

C&R will also be finishing off the GE policy and guidelines and will be bringing that to the Senate on Monday. C&R pulled this from the last Senate meeting agenda because C&R made changes to Area F and the Area F GRP. had not given feedback. C&R has since found that the Area F GRP. is not happy with the changes C&R made. This will be reviewed and finalized today.

C&R will also be reviewing old policies to see what should be removed from the books or updated after they finish with the GE Guidelines.

Questions:
Q: Last year the Senate had a discussion and said that the Senate would align itself with whatever the Area F GRP. faculty wanted and now you are saying they are unhappy with the changes C&R made, but C&R is moving forward with the changes anyway?
A: Yes, C&R voted on those last week. There were four changes C&R made. Two of the changes the Area F GRP. had no problem with. The two changes they took issue with include that they wanted to limit their upper division courses to 35 students, and C&R rejected this. C&R set the cap to 40, which is standardized across all the GE areas. The second thing is that there was concern from the Area F GRP. that had to do with instructor qualification and again had to do with standardization, but C&R was able to resolve this item with the Area F Grp. The last item had to do with grades. The Area F GRP. wanted to have C- as passing for the courses and again, this was very different from all the other GE courses which have D- as passing. This was rejected by C&R.
C: A member expressed concern that the Senate did agree to align itself with whatever the Area F GRP. wanted. This is a problem when we are trying to build relationships with our Ethnic Studies faculty. Uniformity has never been required specifically in our GE package.
A: This was pointed out to the C&R members, which is why we voted on each of these things and both the votes were not unanimous.
C: A member expressed concern about D- being a passing grade.
A: This was discussed a lot in C&R, but in the end the committee voted to have D- as the passing grade.
C: The overall content was very much in the hands of the Area F GRP. and still remains there. Aligning things consistently across the curriculum is not a bad thing. If we are going to look at C- as the passing grade for one area then maybe

4

we should be looking at it for all areas. We need to have this conversation as a campus.

C: Having an experiential mandatory component impacts a cap. For Ethnic Studies that applied component is very important. If you look at the criteria for Ethnic Studies programs at UCLA and Berkeley there is that experiential component. Concern was expressed that any discussion about Area F caps should be robust and take this into account.

Q: With the DFW rate that is being mandated by the Chancellor's Office, I think the D- conversation is a conversation we need to have. C&R may get a referral on this next year. Why should we consider using the D- if we are going to be punished for giving them out, and are being told we need to reduce them?

A: This is not about punishing students. The question is what is the competency that someone has in learning. In a lot of majors, the D does not count. The other thing is the equity gap in DFW rates. It is not simply the DFW rate itself. It is the equity gap that is concerning both to the campus and the system. Is that a pedagogical challenge? Is that the way in which we assess students? Is there a way in which we deploy learning so there is a gap? What is interesting about this gap and what is concerning is that it shows up all over the campus in departments with social justice missions at the front end of how they talk about things. We need to be careful how we characterize some of these issues. It goes to what we think competency in an area is. That is the pedagogical and intellectual conversation we should have. If we don't think there is competency in a "D," then that is an interesting conversation.

8. The meeting adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

These minutes were taken by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on March 14, 2022.
The minutes were edited by Wynn Schultz-Krohn on March 24, 2022.
The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on April 4, 2022.