

Executive Committee of the Academic Senate
Minutes of the Meeting of September 16, 2024
Clark 551, 12 p.m. to 1:30 pm

Present: Joshua Baur, Julia Curry, Vincent Del Casino, Tabitha Hart, Colleen Johnson, Ariana Lacson, Shannon Rose Riley, Karthika Sasikumar, Laura Sullivan-Green, Cynthia Teniente-Matson

Absent: Charlie Faas, Kristin Dukes, Ranko Heindl, Mari Fuentes Martin, Ariana Lacson, Hiu Yung Wong

Minutes taken by Grace Barbieri

1. Update by Chair

a. First Senate Meeting business items

- i. Two important and time-sensitive policies were presented at the first senate meeting of the semester on September 9. C&R presented the new GE policy for a first reading and hopes to bring it back for a final reading at the next senate meeting on September 30th. This is time-sensitive because the new courses must be ready for fall 2025.
- ii. The Committee on Senate Representation, created by the Executive Committee, presented amendments to the constitution and bylaws. The response was mainly positive, and they hope to bring their amendments for final reading on September 30. If passed, the Senate office would prepare a referendum, which would need to be passed by a simple majority of the faculty. Then, it would be sent to the President for approval.

Q: Is what is required the simple majority of those who are voting or all of the faculty members?

A: The bylaws state that a simple majority of those who vote are voting.

Q: Are both policies being brought as final readings, not second readings?

A: As far as I know, yes.

b. Results of the special election in the College of Business

- i. No one stood for the election, so the seat will remain vacant.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of August 26, 2024- unanimously approved

3. President's Update

Today is a very busy day. Over the last ten days or so, we received a request from Secretary Becerra to make an announcement today at the start of Hispanic Heritage Month, which he did. He also announced the (Advanced Research Projects Agency for Health) ARPA-H funding initiative that includes an academic innovators component for faculty and undergraduate and graduate students who are doing research in the ARPA-H. This morning's visit was with a group of students, and we visited with three faculty in their research work, which was very impressive. In ISB, we had a cohort of our delegation here and a press conference on Tower Lawn at 10 am. His staff was here with him today and are with our leadership team. They are going to a series of meetings with faculty and faculty administrators who are doing research in health and health innovation. It is always significant to have any cabinet member on any university campus. It was a special moment for us. The local press stations were there asking questions. Also in attendance were our congressional, city council, and state delegations. We also have a CSU student trustee, Jazmin Guajardo, on the tour.

September 19-20 is the Georgetown free speech initiative. We are the host of this event but not the organizers. Georgetown is holding a dinner at the University House on the 18th. The president of this association will be the moderator.

Q: Are there speakers on the list that would be considered very controversial?

A: It depends on who you are. There are quite a few faculty members. Some are from law schools. Also, the Dean of Berkeley Law, Erwin Chemerinsky, will speak on Friday. The WASC President and an attorney will be on that panel. I don't think the people are controversial, but if you look at the name and the topic, you might feel like you want to come demonstrate. We don't want to diminish that opportunity for students, faculty, and staff, but it is not our event.

Q: Are the events only available in person?

A: Yes, they will be held in the Student Union theater, and different classes have been invited. Our faculty will also bring students there.

Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE)

The program will be for our university to accept WUE participants in academic programs that are not impacted. There is an evaluative metric in which they looked at which programs had capacity in which we could accept students into the WUE program to help grow enrollment in underserved majors. There are three other campuses in the CSUs that are WUE and have the bulk of the students. We are going to place some strategic efforts by signing with WUE at the undergraduate level to start next fall, as well as doing some site visits and promoting in some of the communities that are WUE-eligible institutions to come to SJSU. The goal is to increase enrollment under certain majors and maintain a balance with impacted majors. For marketing and outreach, we are going through the process of looking at financial aid and ensuring adequate support services and housing. We are going slow to go fast in terms of the number of majors we are starting with.

Q: What are the projections in terms of financial benefit to the university?

Provost: When you charge 150% of in-state tuition, you need three students for every two to match it, but if you do it in the right degree programs that are under-enrolled, are there costs on the other side? If you take a program that has classes with space because they are under-enrolled, by approximately 5-8 seats, and then bring in those students, everything above the base tuition is extra. When you do the net tuition analysis, which is what we are doing because we are only focusing on degree programs that have space, there is a direct financial opportunity that comes with that model. But it is a discount, so you are giving away something. The advantage is non-direct revenue because you now have a largely free marketing opportunity. Once you join WUE, you are in their system, so students can see access to the institution and think about our university. The cost that we are saving by doing out-of-state enrollment work is an opportunity cost.

We are not talking about huge numbers, although we could probably have about 500 students in the next few years if we wanted to. Also, we can control that funnel very specifically on an annual basis. When we over-enroll on the state side, we only get tuition, and that's 100%, so if you think about the students in the same way, we are now getting 150% on that over-enrollment. From a financial standpoint, I think it's an opportunity space for us, and I believe it will provide net tuition benefits to the institution. Additionally, WUE will put us in the market in

the 17 states that we do not have right now because we are low on nonresident out of state right now.

4. Academic Freedom Committee–recruitment update

This committee reports to Professional Standards. It comprises four faculty members: two who need to be tenured, one who may be emeriti, and one who may be a lecturer. In addition, one administrator, one staff Non-MPP, and a student. These members are not elected by the college but chosen by this committee. AS already has someone in mind to recommend to the committee. For a staff member, we will reach out to the Staff Council. The AVC is finishing the final touches on the form, but I hope to get this done in the next two to three weeks. The committee will be controversial, and we only want to select people who wholeheartedly wish to be on it.

5. Special presentation–CONFIDENTIAL and time certain (12.15-12.40) by VP for Advancement Judy Nagai on two naming opportunities.

Per university policy, when we have philanthropic naming opportunities for spaces on campus, I convene a naming committee and bring together that group to evaluate those opportunities presented concerning philanthropic naming. The committee includes myself, Beth Colbert, Traci Ferdolage, and two faculty members, Ravisha Mathur and Scott Shaffer. The committee reviewed the two naming opportunities, and we recommend that we move forward with the approval of the naming.

The first is the Lurie College of Education, Sweeney Hall Room 117K, named the Urmil R. Jindia SLP Resource Center. The gift range is \$25,000-50,000. The department that would benefit from the gift would be the Communicative Disorders and Sciences.

When reviewing these cases, we do a brief “background check,” like an internet check. Both sets of donors are known to the university, so there are no red flags or concerns regarding reputation or public information.

Q: What is the contribution going towards within the department? Is it earmarked for something related to that room or going into some general fund?

A: The funds will be used for current use scholarships for students in that department.

Q: Is the name in perpetuity, or is there a time period?

A: It is in perpetuity. If the building was torn down, for example, that would be the time period, and we would typically go back to the donors to let them know these changes are happening. This is different from when we have corporate sponsorships. Those are time-limited to typically five years or another agreed upon time period because we don't keep those permanently.

Q: So, will the amount create an endowment from which they will take money to give scholarships, or will it remain the amount until it gets spent?

A: They will spend the funds. They are current use compared to the endowment. So, the money will be utilized for students.

C: When we look at the different spaces available and the preauthorization, we will see a huge range. This is a space within the SPARC area. It is not an outside door but a room within a space.

C: It is a great opportunity for someone without a lot of funds to make a donation that will be immediately impactful, and there gets to be recognition in the space.

The second naming is for ISB 420 to be named The Nicanor E. and Norma L. Mostajo Bio Equipment Suite. The department that will benefit is Biological Sciences. This will be a current-use gift that the department can use as flexible funds. This room is an equipment room, not one of the public-facing labs.

Q: Both gifts seem to be the first step in engaging these donors in long-term relationships.

A: Yes

Per the policy, we can also seek pre-authorization for spaces we would like to name. While there are a lot of spaces in the new ISA building, we are proposing:
Laboratories and classrooms - \$50,000-\$1,000,000

- Flexible study spaces - \$500,000
- Discovery and experiential research laboratories - \$25,000-\$500,000
- Unique spaces (lobby, seminar rooms, conference rooms) - \$50,000-\$5,000,000

We have the full range of opportunities because we want to be flexible when we talk to donors. Because there is such a big range for gifts, we look at the size of the space, visibility, and equipment rooms. We have a formula we refer back to that accounts for things like square footage and visibility. Depending on the funds, we would have conversations with the donors, deans, or department chairs on how the funds would be utilized. Within our gift agreement, we have an “exit clause” for if, at any time, the donors want to separate from the university, we will remove their signage. Additionally, if we choose not to want to be affiliated with the donor anymore relating to something negative in the media, we would remove their signage, but we do not give the money back.

Shannon Rose Riley moved to approve the naming of the Lurie College of Education, Sweeney Hall Room 117K, the Urmil R. Jindia SLP Resource Center. Julia Curry seconded the motion. The committee approved unanimously.

Tabitha Hart moved to approve the naming of the College of Science, ISB Room 420, The Nicanor E. and Norma Mostajo Bio Equipment Suit. Julia Curry seconded the motion. The committee approved unanimously.

Shannon Rose Riley moved to approve the Interdisciplinary Science Building (ISB) pre-authorization for named spaces. Tabitha Hart seconded the motion. The committee approved unanimously.

6. Recommendations to the Provost for the members of the Selection Committee for CFETI AVP (time certain 12.40 to 1.10)

It is very exciting to have the opportunity to fill this role, which has been vacant since January. I don't want people to think of this critical unit on campus as not relevant to every stage of their professional development. We want to look at what it looks like for faculty to stay invested in their growth and feel engaged and supported to develop. My vision is to have someone who is a spokesperson for the work of this unit who takes it out to the colleges and faculty and excites them

about the available expertise. They need to have a vision of what it means to be an engaged faculty member in higher education at this time in this place. Faculty success matters because it is directly connected to student success. We have already received applications from faculty, staff, and administrators for the selection committee. We are currently having a hard time recruiting a student member.

The committee recommends to the Provost for an administrator committee members Christina Mune and Mary Anderson.

The committee recommends to the Provost for a staff committee member, Sara Bakalian.

The committee recommends to the Provost for faculty committee members: Jonathan Gomez, Ali Mehran, Sandra Zuniga Ruiz, Mark Van Selst, Angela Wu

7. New format for end-of-the-year reporting

The current format for year-end reports is that all committee chairs prepare a report using a very minimal template, and the agendas are uploaded to the Senate website. This contradicts the idea of ‘closing the loop’ in academia, where no one gets back to chairs. Also, the reports are due at an awkward time in the summer when chairs are mostly unpaid and do not have access to their committee members. The idea would be to hold a short series of meetings on Zoom where the committee chairs would give oral summaries of their work that academic year. The meeting would be open to the SJSU community and senators but not mandatory. People might be interested in the different committees. This would give the committee chairs and their members a chance to report to the public at large and even field questions to get a sense from community members. Instead of a written report, it would be a 10-15 minute report with slides and a Q-A section. This can make it more interactive and connect committee members and their work with the public they serve. The current reports are mostly likely just filed away and not looked at by many people.

Q: What is the purpose of archiving or getting feedback? It might be more of a workload to prepare a presentation.

A: The Zoom records and slides could be achieved instead of the report.

Depending on the committee, the report could be 5-15 minutes. If we were to do this, it would be advisable to have some kind of prompt.

C: The BAC is advisory to the president, but it is a matter of great concern on any university campus on any matters relevant to finance. I have taken some intentional approaches to reconstitute the BAC and really refocus on their efforts because of the financial situation we've found ourselves in. I think there is always a public out-facing look at the budget advisory work in any public or private university. It can have different names, but the charge and the scope are the same- advisory to the president on institutional finances. This is also something that accrediting bodies look at as well. The BAC, while it has a chair and a co-chair, is also very much staffed and supported by the AVP for Finance, the budget director, the Office of the President, and sometimes the Office of the Provost. When you compare the output of the BAC and all of the other committees, there is, in my opinion, a very different external necessity for what comes from the BAC versus another committee. I would caution you when using it as a framing because it has been a lift to get there and serves another purpose beyond closing the loop.

C: I am experiencing something at the statewide senate side. The end-of-year report should tie to what the committee is and its mandates in the constitution and bylaws. It is what was accomplished throughout the year, given the issues carried over from last year and new priorities that emerged, like COVID. It is not about payment but fulfilling the mandates. If I were a new person coming to the Senate, I would want some ambiguity removed. They need to know what it means to be a member of the different committees and what they should know. I feel that the senators don't always go back and report to the constituents. I have often seen that there is no report for the ASCSU representative on the senate minutes, even when I always provide a written report. Year-end reports are to be looked at in terms of the mandates. It is a guide for next year, but we're also bound by changes out of our control, such as the CA legislature or the Chancellor's Office. We always have to be able to pivot a little bit.