

Executive Committee of the Academic Senate  
Minutes of the Meeting of March 3, 2025  
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, Cynthia Teniente-Matson, Hiu Yung Wong

**Absent:** Mari Fuentes Martin, Tabitha Hart, Stan Nosek, Kristin Dukes, Julia Curry

1. Update by the Chair

- a. The names from all the Award Committees have been forwarded to the President and she is considering them.
- b. I have forwarded six names to the Phone Transition Committee.
- c. The SoS passed at the last senate meeting required it to be sent to a long list of people and it has been sent to them all.

2. Update by the President

We are preparing for the upcoming WASC visit. We submitted all our documents and are getting feedback. We are working with Moss Landing Laboratories on the final stages.

Questions

Q: Do you have a sense of how it's going with WASC?

A: I have a meeting with the chair of the committee and the Chancellor tomorrow, so I will have a better sense then.

Q: Does the state of California have any DEI policies?

A: CA completes with Prop 209, which is the overarching work ensuring equal access of propositions for all. Our office of general counsel has thoroughly reviewed the Dear Colleague letter from the Department of Education. At our campus, we have reviewed all our websites to ensure we are in compliance with Prop 209. Last week, the FAQs about the letter came out from the Office of Civil Rights, and we've been reviewing them.

Q: SJSU has been very active in building a connection between SJSU and the industry and branding our image in that space. Have you felt any drawbacks, or are companies starting to hold their programs?

A: We have not felt any drawbacks from the industry. I have not experienced anything that would suggest slowing anything down. In fact, we're doubling down our efforts in what we are doing with the industry.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of February 10, 2025 - approved unanimously
4. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of February 17, 2025- approved unanimously
5. Consent Calendar

There are a couple of changes, mainly student changes to correct.

6. Appointments to the Board of Professional Responsibility

The newly formed Board of Professional Responsibility, which was previously the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility, even in its previous form, had trouble getting filled because of its requirements and some conflict about what it was supposed to do. After the recent reform, the board was split into the Academic Freedom Committee, which is functioning well, and the Board of Professional Responsibility. Getting this board filled and started on their work is important because one of its charges is to "Review and adjudicate disputes regarding Student Fairness Committee recommendations." So we're at the point in the semester where we might be getting challenges to the recommendations of the SFC. Last semester, I sent out a call to faculty members, and we received three applications. The membership "will consist of five faculty members-at-large, each from a different college/academic unit; membership is restricted to tenured faculty and Senior Lecturer faculty, with a majority of tenured professors. The members shall be appointed by the Academic Senate after recommendation by the Senate Executive Committee."

The Executive Committee unanimously approved recommending Shannon Rose Riley, Karthika Sasikumar, and Laura Sullivan-Green to the Board of Professional Responsibility. The terms will be decided once the board is completed. The Senate Chair will contact more potential applicants and bring them back to the Executive Committee.

7. Constituting the Lecturer Electorate

A few months ago, ASCSU modified its Constitution to create three designated lecturer seats. On our senate, lecturers run for college seats like any other faculty member, but we do not have any

assigned seats. The ASCSU has set these seats aside for lecturers, and lecturers are to elect them. So, all the campuses' lecturers have to vote to elect these lecturers, but it will not be direct because there will be a lecturer electorate. So we need to conduct an election for SJSU's lecturer representative for the lecturer electorate. There are two options: have our current lecturer senators Raymand Buyco, Sabrina Pinnell, and Reiko Kataoka choose among themselves the representatives or have our Lecturer Council conduct the election. The Lecturer Council is part of CFA, which is the faculty union. There is precedent for this because we have used the Staff Council before. I have asked other Senate Chairs and at other CSUs, their Lecturer Councils have conducted the elections, including Dr. Boyd's college, CSU Chico. However, some chairs have said they don't think it is appropriate to use the Lecturer Council since it is outside the Senate and the University.

C: Could the Senate Office not organize any election for the lecturer representative?

A: Yes, we could do it. We just don't have the list of lecturers and the appointment times already, like the Lecturer Council.

C: The Provost's office can help with the election in the future when it is conducted in the Senate's office.

Q: Do the current lecturer senators have to choose among themselves or can they choose anyone?

A: They have to choose among themselves. Our lecturer senators are also eligible to be the person who becomes the lecturer senator to the ASCSU.

Q: What if we don't have any lecturer senators one year?

A: Yes, there is a problem with choosing that option.

Q: Are we stuck with our choices for this year, or can we change them going forward?

A: I can verify that, but we can change it going forward.

The Executive Committee agreed to have the lecturer senators select their representatives given the time constraints, but in years where there are fewer than three lecturer senators, elections will be conducted by the Senate office.

#### 8. SMR on senate re-organization

After the last senate meeting, the consensus was that there is not much support for splitting ISA, and the student affairs committee would not constitute a sufficient policy committee. We could propose splitting and augmenting student affairs' charge to give it more meat. Or there is no split, and we have to seat the six new senators on current policy committees.

C: I understand how people might feel like there is not enough work or resources for another policy committee; however, what is most important is to figure out where we will put these new

senators, especially the staff senators. We have to give them respectful places and welcome them.

C: We could consider allowing the new six senators to sit on certain operating committees, like SF or GEAC, that feed up to the policy committees since they could use more support.

C: We could put them on these operating committees; however, there is the issue of workload fairness. Our policy committees meet every Monday that the Senate is not in session; however, if these new senators go on operating committees, they don't always meet once a week.

C: I don't think it's fair for senators not to sit on policy committees, not just because of their workload. Working on these policy committees helps train senators and future senate leadership. Working on and writing policies helps senators learn more about our policies. This could also create a flawed perception that you're either a senator on a policy committee or not.

C: We could write the bylaws to place these new senators on policy committees as "Senators at large" since we might have fewer or more from each college.

C: I want to point out that WASC will be more concerned about where we put the staff senators. We want to ensure they feel welcomed and integrated into the Senate. Tabitha and I are going to spend time making sure they get oriented to the Senate and its procedures.

C: ISA could be a good place for staff members, but if we add them to ISA, we should move one of the student senators to another policy committee. They all have one year and ISA has three student senators, and one graduate student.

A: Removing a student senator would lower the percentage of the voting membership of the students.

C: If we still do the split of ISA and create an operating committee of student affairs, wouldn't that still make space on ISA for a new staff senator?

C: The only community not represented on the Executive Committee is staff, so you could add staff to the Executive Committee. It would be very bold, but it would also be an opportunity to elevate staff voices. I also think that OG is a logical possibility for staff and also ISA.

Q: Are you suggesting a staff member be a chair of a committee?

A: No.

C: The bylaws would then have to be changed because senators have to serve on a policy committee, and technically, all the seats on the executive committee are EXO.

C: It would also be unfair to give someone a seat on the executive committee without them being elected since that is how we were appointed here. However, staff senators should be able to run for Senate Officer positions so they can have a chance to be on the Executive Committee.

C: But since they don't have assigned time, that could be hard with the pay structure.

Q: How does this body feel about splitting ISA?

C: Not really in favor.

C: The argument that SA is more an operating committee than a policy committee makes more sense.

Q: Could we remove some of the administrators from ISA?

A: It is possible. I think the dean's seats should probably stay.

A: Enrollment brings a lot of information we need in ISA.

Q: How are we going to present all the options?

C: The plan of splitting ISA into two policy committees is dead in the water.

C: Creating SA into an operating committee is still plausible.

C: I think the two plans are not splitting ISA and just putting the new six senators on the current policy committees; and splitting ISA and creating SA into an operating committee, which will free up some space, and still having to figure out where the new senators go.

The minutes were taken by Grace Barbieri on March 3, 2025, reviewed and accepted by Senate Chair Karthika Sasikumar on March 6, 2025, and approved by the Senate Executive Committee on March 10, 2025.