

Executive Committee of the Academic Senate  
Minutes of the Meeting of September 23, 2024  
Clark 551, 12 p.m. to 1:30 pm

**Present:** Joshua Baur, Vincent Del Casino, Ranko Heindl, Colleen Johnson, Ariana Lacson, Shannon Rose Riley, Karthika Sasikumar, Laura Sullivan-Green, Hiu Yung Wong

**Absent:** Julia Curry, Charlie Faas, Kristin Dukes, Tabitha Hart, Mari Fuentes Martin, Cynthia Teniente-Matson

Minutes taken by Grace Barbieri

1. Update by Chair
  - a. Free Speech Initiative

I want to compliment the President and the Provost for a very engaging two days. It was heartening to see that we are not just cheerleaders for AI but also provide critical questioning perspectives on all things technological in Silicon Valley. We did not have a lot of students in the audience, and I feel this about a lot of our events. I wish there were a way to get more of our students to come because when they do, they always ask questions and eagerly listen.

- b. Recruitment for Academic Freedom Committee

We have finished the form for the Academic Freedom Committee; it will go out in a few hours. I wanted help with the recruitment of the staff member for the committee. The policy does not specify how the staff member should be chosen. It just says there will be a staff member on the committee. We have a couple of options. The first is approaching the Staff Council and asking them to nominate someone. We have done this in the past for other bodies. We could also ask University Personnel to send a message to all staff asking them to apply. We would then need to make a rubric to choose applicants, which would be more democratic.

C: There might be other options that are less democratic but more efficient. I am thinking of staff members who participated in the Public Voices fellowship workshops and who have published Op-Eds. One of these staff members would be great for this type of communication.

A: I can think of several other great staff members. I want to make sure our selection procedure is fair.

C: I think you should put out a call, as we have done for faculty and ask them to submit statements. Then, anyone can send that call to people we think could be good for the committee.

Q: Put out a call where? We are just trying to figure out how to disseminate the call.

C: The Office of Provost can message all the staff

2. Approval of the Minutes of the meeting of September 16, 2024- approved unanimously.

3. Consent Calendar- approved unanimously.

C: These are the updates since the last senate meeting.

Q: Are there inquiries for the seats at large, like on professional standards?

A: Not yet. We are sending out emails.

C: Student Fairness is hurting, and we don't want the petitions to pile up.

4. selection for Interfaith Task Force: Preliminary discussions were initiated and the body decided to continue the discussions at the next meeting.

5. Presentation by Andrew Wright, Senior AVP for Enrollment Management on the WUE project ( Time certain 12:45- 1:00)

Several CSUs are involved in WUE.. Our goal is to increase our nonresident enrollment. We allow students to apply for specific majors and get into WUE, and then they pay 150% of resident tuition instead of full nonresident tuition. We are going to increase brand presence where we may or may not have been before. We selected majors in conjunction with the deans and associate deans to ensure we didn't impact any current students coming from those states.

Q: Has there been, or is there a way to estimate, how many CA resident students the WUE might draw out of CA and away from SJSU?

A: If a student is here in CA and decides to go to Arizona, whether we opt into WUE or not, they can still participate in WUE because that state or institution is already a part of it. CA is a net exporter of WUE students.

Q: Is WUE solely in person, online, or both?

A: It is for resident state-side enrollment. Self-support does not have an out-of-state differential, so it does not apply to WUE.

Q: Do we have adequate residential facilities for those students in different scenarios?

A: Yes, these students would have access to housing per the usual process for all out-of-state students.

Q: We have a state mandate for residents. Since WUE is 1.5 times the resident students, does that mean their income to SJSU will be lower than that of a resident student?

A: Yes and no. We have a student who is a California resident, and they are part of our target, so we get a match. If a resident is not part of our target, we only get their tuition. Then, a nonresident student pays the resident plus \$398 a unit. WUE splits the difference. Additionally, if you pick the right program that is slightly under-enrolled and they have spaces in the classes, we are not generating new costs.

Q: The main goal is to help those under-enrolled classes and programs.

A: Yes, which is why consultations with the deans and associated deans were essential to finalizing that list of majors.

C: If you are a WUE student, you can move around on campus but must stay in a WUE major. If you were to transfer into a non-WUE major, you pay regular non-resident tuition and fees. WUE is offered two years for transfer students, and four years for first-year students to reinforce graduation initiatives.

Q: How do you choose the departments and programs that will participate in WUE?

A: We looked at what programs are impacted and ran an analysis to identify where nonresident students are and if we had large groups we recommended to the college that it was not a good one for the WUE students to go to because other students might complain if they came a different year they could have paid less. We still got to 114 majors.

C: We already built a WUE webpage but it won't be live until we complete our profile. But it will be up very soon.

Q: How will this impact in-state students?

A: This won't impact them at all.

Q: The WUE students also be impacted by the tuition spike?

A: Yes

Q: If you offer a major under WUE for one year and then stop offering it, will the students lose WUE eligibility?

A: No, they are grandfathered in. It's part of the agreement.

C: It does say if you go to year five, you have to pay full out-of-state tuition.

Q: How will this affect athletic scholarships? Will the scholarships be for 150%? When they are recruiting, can they encourage their students to apply for these programs?

A: We haven't discussed this with the coaches yet. The discussion is at the cabinet level right now.

Q: Do you check the average graduation time for the degrees? If the average is six years and they only have four years, that can be tough.

A: Big picture, we want everyone to graduate in four years. That was part of the GI 2025 initiative where we have exceeded the goal for that.

Q: Is there a reason we are restricting this to only undergraduates? Is there a plan for graduate students?

A: It is a different program for graduates.

Q: Will there be some advising and social support for WUE students when they come?

C: That is a good recommendation. We 441 nonresident students are already coming from these states and so all of our non residents need that support. I will follow up with Mari.

## 6. Questions

- a. For Joshua Baur, Organization and Government: progress on the hearing re the merger of URP & ENVS

We are meeting today to hopefully set up all processes and protocols for the hearing because no guide or template has been found. We met with Ken Peter last Monday to discuss the hearing he has been a part of. One member of O&G asked if we even needed to do the hearing, which surprised me because I thought we were past that decision. I am reviewing the information I have available. We received a letter from the ENVS faculty outlining their complaints and a report from Dean Todd on how they managed the merger. Today, we will hopefully resolve the question of even having the hearing. I was privy to a lot of the communication before the hearing request because it looks like I am transferring to Environmental Studies.

I have had a lot of conversations with the Environmental Studies faculty, their chair, and Lynne Trulio, who is the official submitter of the hearing. We will probably be doing it remotely using Zoom Conference. People can watch and listen but can't speak. It may take a couple of days because I want to make sure any stakeholder has this opportunity to be heard. Ken Peter emphasized that it is one of the more important parts of the hearing. It is an opportunity for the faculty who felt things had not been done properly; it allows them to air that out publicly. The hearing has no practical significance because the merger is going forward. Still, Ken pointed out that it allows us to review how the process worked and review the policy to see if it needs to be updated. This is more about what can be done in the future rather than addressing anything that has already happened.

C: Is there no curriculum perspective worth hearing or stating? It seems either groundbreaking, radical, or problematic to merge urban planning with environmental studies. You're either saying you're going to be doing urban planning in such a way the two are cohesive moving forward, or you're subsuming environmental studies into something that is not going to pay attention to it in a way that environmental studies is moving as a field. Is it really a done deal? Has the faculty considered writing to the Chronicle of Higher Education? Have you looked thoroughly at the policy around faculty owning the curriculum?

C: That is one of the things being disputed as to how much others were involved.

A: Yes, the Environmental Studies faculty do not feel engaged in this process.

C: The official line is that the merger was an attempt to solve under-enrollment. I don't think every faculty member in Environmental Studies is against the merger.

C: Environmental Studies is one of the programs that has always been a little soft. Urban and regional planning has always had more of a graduate program than they do an undergraduate program. If they blend the two, then Environmental Studies brings in the undergraduate competent while Urban and Regional Planning brings in the graduate competent.

Q: I don't remember whether the petition mentioned that the students were not adequately consulted.

A: That is correct. Twelve students responded to a survey, but I don't believe there were any direct conversions with students.

Q: When we have these mergers, and we expect more of these, even though this one cannot be reversed, our purpose is to set good practices for future mergers. So, how should students be considered? Should AS have a role in facilitating that consultation with students, and why were students not adequately considered?

Q: Was it a general email blast to all students in Environmental Studies and Urban and Regional Planning? Also, what was the turnaround time for the survey? Is there a better way to announce it than by getting an email from the dean? I don't know if the undergraduate students know who their dean is.

Q: When did the vote for the merger occur?

A: It all happened in the spring. The dean announced they were considering the merger on February 21st, which was finalized in May. Throughout the process, you can clearly see that the Environmental Studies faculty wanted more time to talk and evaluate the merger. They feel it was a rushed process where they didn't have adequate time to think about it.

C: If the faculty felt that way, I am sure the students felt that way, too. I know many students are struggling across the CSUs with course cuts. So, students have to push their

time here a semester more because they can get into the classes they want, or the classes get cut. Also, the summer sessions too because small departments offer classes other than GEs over summer and winter. I am not sure of AS's role in this because AS is really for advocacy efforts. If multiple mergers happen, they will conflict with the policy agenda of the AS board of directors. I am sure we would like to be a part of gathering more input and giving ideas to the deans for marketing; however, it could be time-consuming because it is already time-consuming to get students on the university committees.

- b. For Charlie Faas, what are the financial implications of the departure of four teams from the Mountain West conference? Is SJSU attempting to join the PAC-12 and how would that affect the budget?

Provost: This is more of a Jeff [Konya] question. It is very unclear right now because you have to have 8 teams to stay in the bowl series. There is going to have to be recruitment to the Mountain West. Those campuses also have to pay back a lot of money back to the MW.

- c. For Charlie Faas, I was cc'd on an email from Senator Simon Rodan to the President asking for the results of the investigation of the February 2024 protest and incident at Sweeney Hall. Can you share any updates on the investigation?

Provost: The investigation is still ongoing, with no updates.

- d. For Charlie Faas and Vincent Del Casino, can you speak to the outlook for relaxing austerity measures this AY? Will hiring staff and/or TT faculty pick up again?

Provost: We are not out of austerity. At the last senate meeting, I stated that we have authorized 55 tenure track searches. We were still at the top of the heap over the last seven years regarding total tenure-track hiring. I am close to having authorized close to 350-400 searches since I have been Provost. The staff hiring is happening. I am getting requests and pushing them forward. They are happening as fast as possible because the President still has to approve them all. In my first year, we authorized 80 searches. The low has been 40, and we're at 55 this year. What has happened is we are making strategic hiring decisions around where enrollment growth will go or how it leads to strategic priorities relative to what we want to teach or where we have funding.

Q: Is the President's approval needed for every hire on campus?

A: Yes, that is built into the budget this year so that we can ensure that the commitment to the 6% cut holds.

Q: Is the President signing off on lecturer hires?

A: No. Faculty hiring is left to the discretion of the Provost's office for the instructional budget. The freezing is on the staff side.

- e. For Charlie Faas, VP of IT Bob Lim sent a Sept 9th email about upgrades to learning spaces: The Learning Space Upgrade and Academic Technology Strategy (LSUATS). Are any such upgrades coming up or planned for meeting spaces (Ex ENG 285/287, YUH 243, CL412)? (from Josh Baur)

Provost: The assessment is supposed to take place, and they are not going to spend any money until we know where the plan is going. As far as I know, there is no list of these things that are getting updated for technology. There have been some replacements of various technologies in some places, which are happening regularly. We have to finish the assessment that Bob is running.

Q: So, is Deloitte not looking at meeting spaces or just globally throughout the university?

A: There is an overlap. Eng 285/287 is a classroom, so yes. Anything that has a pedagogical value, like a meeting room that holds a seminar, would be part of the evaluation. The whole thing is about faculty work in the classroom. When they do the survey and conversions, you are encouraged to bring that up.

C: Last week at the free speech event, we had visitors from outside Silicon Valley, and our mics were failing. I can't believe we can't spend enough money on mics.

- f. Any updates on CSR's work on Senate expansion measures?

I have since learned they are now bringing a second reading with the possibility of moving it to a final reading on the floor. The reason for that is that I would like the vote to happen next Monday. The next full meeting will be held on November 4th if we don't do it. I have learned from the co-chairs that they wanted more time to respond to the concerns raised at the last senate meeting. I told them I don't think they should give up the opportunity to present on Monday. We can postpone it until November 4 if they find a huge opposition.

Q: Was there a discussion at the cabinet level about changing the proposal?

A: No, they were taking the Senate's lead.

I have a request for everyone here. I am concerned that there are some misconceptions about what the Senate expansion is really about. I don't want to take away anyone's right to vote on the referendum when it comes out; however, I don't want them to vote no for the wrong reasons. I don't want them to vote 'no' because they think there is a conspiracy. Please talk to your colleagues. The co-chairs and I are available to answer questions. I have encouraged the Committee on Senate Representation to make a FAQ document that can be circulated.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 PM.

The minutes were taken by Grace Barbieri on September 23, 2024, reviewed and accepted by Senate Chair Karthika Sasikumar on October 3, 2024, and approved by the Senate Executive Committee on October 7, 2024.