

ATTENDANCE: Abel-Mills, Baljon, Barbone, Brooks, Butler Byrd, Fuller, Hernandez, Kamper, Lach, Love, Marx, Moore, Ornatowski, Ozturk, Rhodes, Schellenberg, Sharma, Vasquez, Weston, Wills.

Guests: Csomay, McCall, Rehfuss, Sheehan, Wilson.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Secretary Fuller announces we have quorum.

Chair Butler Byrd calls the meeting to order at 2:02pm

1.1. Land Acknowledgement

We stand upon a land that carries the footsteps of millennia of Kumeyaay people. They are a people whose traditional lifeways intertwine with a worldview of earth and sky in a community of living beings. This land is part of a relationship that has nourished, healed, protected and embraced the Kumeyaay people to the present day. It is part of a world view founded in the harmony of the cycles of the sky and balance in the forces of life. For the Kumeyaay, red and black represent the balance of those forces that provide for harmony within our bodies as well as the world around us.

As students, faculty, staff and alumni of San Diego State University we acknowledge this legacy from the Kumeyaay. We promote this balance in life as we pursue our goals of knowledge and understanding. We find inspiration in the Kumeyaay spirit to open our minds and hearts. It is the legacy of the red and black. It is the land of the Kumeyaay.

Eyay e'Hunn My heart is good.

—*Michael Miskwish, Kumeyaay Nation*

Chair Butler Byrd read the Land Acknowledgement.

1.2. Principles of Shared Governance

Trust is recognized as a fundamental ingredient that is essential for effective shared governance. Without trust, the practices of partnership, inclusion, open communication, ownership, and accountability are likely to break down. SDSU community members have identified three key principles for shared governance at SDSU that all rely on the fundamental ingredient of TRUST: Respect, Communication, Responsibility.

Chair Butler Byrd read the Principles of Shared Governance.

1.3. Welcome (Butler-Byrd)

Chair Butler Byrd welcomes the Senators and guests, noting the importance of our commitment to shared governance.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (Fuller)

Secretary Fuller moved approval of today' agenda. Approved by unanimous consent.

3. APPROVAL OF SENATE MEETING MINUTES (Fuller)

3.1. SEC Meeting Minutes for 9/20/22: https://senate.sdsu.edu/_pages_sec

Motion (**Fuller/Weston**) to approve of the SEC Meeting Minutes from 9/20/22. Approved by unanimous consent.

4. REPORTS

4.1. SEC Report (Butler-Byrd)

4.1.1. Update on the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) Cal-GETC ([AB-928](#)) Survey & [ICAS Report](#)

Chair Butler Byrd: A survey meant to collect SDSU campus feedback about AB 928 is due by this Friday, October 21. We have noted quite a number of communications on our listserv where folks feel like they don't have enough information to complete the survey. I do want to reiterate that we have had this item on the agenda for the past couple of meetings, but it's a complicated set of issues. I know that Eniko, who is serving as ASCSU G-Act Chair probably has some comments that she'd like to make.

But, Senate Leadership did work to get speakers on the last Senate meeting agenda, where Senator Schultze did make some comments about some of the concerns he has having to do with the history department in particular, and language issues that could possibly be affected by this new legislation. It is a piece of legislation. I know that the ASCSU and ICAS have worked hard to try to come up with some kind of a policy, so that the administration won't take over the curriculum, because that's what the struggle really is.

So, I'm going to open the floor right now to see if there's anybody who would like to make some comments or ask any additional questions about the survey. It is an important way to give feedback to the ASCSU about how to proceed.

Abel-Mills: I'm just going to reiterate what I put in the listserve, because I do appreciate that this is brought up today, and I think mine is less that it's been on the the agenda multiple times, and more that I'm worried that the stakeholders I think should be able to give input didn't know it was an option. So, I brought it up to our undergrad advisors and the Assistant Dean of Student Affairs, and they'd never heard of it. And really I just don't feel educated enough to make a decision about undergraduate curriculum when I'm not in charge of undergraduate curriculum, and so I ask them for guidance like: "What does this actually mean for our students?" They said, "Well, we've never even heard of this."

So, my bigger concern is less the amount of time, than it is that the people who should be having the discussion and making the vote have input. We should be getting input from the people who are interacting, who are actually doing the curricular mapping, who are doing the hands on advising with the students, and who really know the ins and outs of what the long term ramifications of this are going to be. So I don't feel very comfortable making a vote because I don't feel like the people who I serve as a Senator didn't know it was happening.

Chair Butler Byrd: Senator Abel Mills, you bring up an excellent point. Since you are a representative for your college, we do hope that you have been relaying the information and soliciting feedback! We're a representative body, so we do need your help in sharing and gathering that information. I also do not work directly with undergrads, and so I had to go and talk with the various programs in my college to find out what they thought about these various issues, and I do feel like their voices just need to be heard through our representation as their representatives on the Senate.

Csomay: There are three groups (Community Colleges, the CSU and the UC). In a way we are failing in our shared governance process, because we were given the opportunity to actually give feedback on this, and give input on the work that created this. So, whether I agree with it or not, I feel like I need to support this plan just so the Chancellor's office is not taking over and determining what should be cut and what shouldn't be cut. I really don't know what that would look like, and I feel like it might be more than what we are seeing here. But, if you have any questions on this, I hope I can answer them. Not all of them, I think already Arlette asked some questions on the discussion board that I didn't know the answer to, but in fact, AVPs McCall and Hyman had some answers to those. I think it's all of us trying to figure out what the meaning of this is at this point, and I think the ramifications will come after, so we will see what this really means in the long run.

Chair Butler Byrd notes that Senator McCall has put a link to the ICAS report in the chat, and

encourages anyone interested to take a look.

4.1.2. Senate Executive Committee (SEC) (Butler Byrd)

4.1.2.1. Selection of External Faculty Member Pool for Review Committees:

Google Form link:

https://assets.comevoservice.com/media/sdsu-compatible/media_images/CS_SP_AG_Slide2Participation.jpg

Chair Butler Byrd notes we are still trying to fill the external faculty member pool for administrator review panels. She also notes that the Senate Analyst Mario Saldana has sent out requests to college reps, and will follow up to help us fill that pool.

4.1.2.2. **Referral 11/2020: Academic Dishonesty During COVID-19 Online Teaching (Butler Byrd)**

Chair Butler Byrd notes that Senator Hentschel brought to the attention of Senate Leaders that this referral was not moved into the new Trello online management system. We have asked for relevant reports relating to work done in support of this referral. Once these reports are received by the SEC, SEC may be able to determine if the referral needs to be revised, reactivated, etc.

Chair Butler Byrd takes a moment of personal privilege to thank Senator Cezar Ornatowski for his many years of service to the SDSU and ASCSU Senates, and for being her personal mentor as a dedicated Senator and leader.

Ornatowki notes it has been his honor to serve on the SDSU Senate for 22 years, and 14 years on the ASCSU. He has appreciated the profound connection this service has helped him make with our campus and the CSU-system as a whole.

Chair Butler Byrd asks **Chair Marx** for a status update concerning the election of a replacement for Senator Ornatowski as an ASCSU representative for SDSU, and **Chair Marx** notes the election is in progress and a replacement will be identified by the end of the week.

4.2. Senate Vice Chair’s Report (Vasquez)

4.2.1. Referral Chart.....Page 5

Vice Chair Vasquez presents the current referral chart. There were no questions.

4.3. Senate Treasurer’s Report (Sharma)

4.3.1. Senate Expenditures & Assigned Time Audit.....Page 6

Treasurer Sharma presents the current Senate Budget Report, and notes that the course buyout transfers are not yet included in this list. Secretary Fuller notes there have been some adjustments to the FAH in the Senate and this has caused delays in gathering data.

4.4. Provost’s Report (Ochoa)

- 4.4.1. Sabbatical application and review process
- 4.4.2. G.I. 2020 Graduate Rates
- 4.4.3. WSCUS (McCall)

Provost Ochoa: My report on my report will be brief, and I plan to yield my time to Jerry Sheehan, CIO. He should be here in a few minutes. But first, I want to give you an update on several searches. We've already started the searches for the two deans, which are in progress, and the committees have convened and are finalizing the job descriptions. So, that is moving forward.

The Senate has provided me with the names for the search committee members for the internal search for AVP of Curriculum, Assessment and Accreditation. We are trying to complete that search. I'm in the process of asking for the appointees that the President makes to complete that search committee, so we can begin.

There are some big factors going on in the CA system. As you know, we were given money for enrollment growth, and we have a compact with the governor that he would continue to give us the money as long as we did two things: 1) increase our enrollment, and as in the system wide, and 2) to improve graduation rates. I wanted to share with the group that we ran some preliminary numbers, and my understanding is that they will be finalized next week, but I want to give you a forecast of those numbers.

With respect to enrollment, what we're seeing is that we're at a very critical point within the system. We have our enrollment target, and the way it works is that we're given a target that we negotiate with the system, and if you go over that target, you get no additional state dollars. You only get money for the target that you meet. So if your target is 100, and you go 104, you

still only get state dollars for the 100, which was the target. For the remaining 4%, you only get tuition. So it costs us more when we go over the target. Right now, we are at 99.8% of our enrollment target, so we're within two tenths of one, which is very, very good.

My understanding, from what I've heard and been told, is only three campuses met their enrollment target this time. The entire system, in terms of FTE enrollment is down by 7%, which means about 25,000 FTE fewer across the twenty-three campuses, which is very significant. In two years, California is going to have an enrollment cliff problem with the numbers going down, so considering everything, I want to give a shout out to Stefan Hyman and Jeannie Stronach, because at 99.8%, you're there! When you're off, even by 1%, you're there, and we probably would have met right where we needed to be, but we had some students defer their admission to the fall. We're doing very well on our campus with that, because we focus very critically on enrollment, and Explore SDSU, and the chairs outreach work, all of those things make a difference. So for us we're in good standing. But, I am concerned about where we are in the system, and that has huge impacts. SDSU is not completely independent because we can do well, but if other campuses are not doing well, that's a big factor. Because the system as a whole didn't meet its goal, we didn't meet that part of the compact, so we'll see what the governor says.

The second thing is our graduation rates, and we have some preliminary rates that will be confirmed. Let me just give you a broad overview, and then, once the numbers are finalized, I'll present a more detailed report to the Senate. It's very, very important that we look at the four-year graduation rates for the group that started in 2018. Their first year was face to face, and then in their sophomore year we had COVID, and they were virtual. Most of their junior year was all virtual, and they came back to finish their senior year. So with all those obstacles, and and you know, Joanna and I put some support programs in on steroids. Our overall graph shows the 4-year graduation rate went from 56.6% to 56.3%. We only had a drop of three tenths of a point. Considering that this cohort was out for almost a year and a half on virtual only learning, and dealing with a lot of issues, like health issues, I'm glad that we're able to hold, because that's statistically insignificant. What we did see is a drop in Under-represented Minority URM 4-year graduation rates from 51.8% to 48.4%, which is a three point drop. However, our non-URM went up by one point one. So, we saw that COVID did have a disproportionate impact on URM students. The biggest concern is the 4-year graduation rate for African American students as it dropped from 51.6% to 41.5%.

However, our 6-year graduation rates have improved. Looking at the group that enrolled in 2016, our 6-year graduation rate went up from 77.7% to 78%, and the impact across different ethnic groups was less than 1% drop. So, our 6-year graduation rate did project up, but our 4-year graduation rate, as students took a few more hours during COVID, was really impacted by the pandemic. Our transfer graduation rate, the cohort related to the 2-year graduation rate,

started their first year all virtual, and we knew that that would have an impact. Our 2-year graduation rate dropped by five from 60.3% to 55.5%. However, our 4-year graduation rate went up by almost a percentage point, and our 4-year graduation rate right now for transfers is 88.8%.

To put this into perspective, look at the 6-year graduation rates of our students. Look at the 6-year graduation rate for our full-time freshman, which is at 78%. The national average is 60%. So. We are 18% above the national average. We are going to monitor that, and keep looking at this data, and then, we will run reports by college so we can see where the highest risk factors are for graduation rates. We will be meeting with the deans, Joanna and I, to prepare and review college insight plans.

In terms of how do we compare to the system? Our 4-year graduation rate is at 56.3%, and the system is at 35%, so we're 21% percent above the system when all campuses are averaged together. The latest 6-year graduation rate for the system is 62.4%, and SDSU's is 78%, or sixteen points above the system average. For 2-year graduation rates for transfers, the system is at 40%, and SDSU is at 55.5%; SDSU is about sixteen points above the system. For 4-year transfers' graduation rates, the system is at 80%, and SDSU is at 88%, an eight point difference. So, we are meeting a lot of our compact goals for the system.

I hope to give a visual presentation with the preliminary numbers where I'll show some graphs for us, once the numbers are finalized. We're holding our own, and we've shown improvements in the long term, but we've seen drops. I think with COVID as a factor, the drops we experienced would be even more significant had we not intervened with some of the proactive interventions we did through Faculty Advancement and Student Success. I just want to give you all a heads up because there will be a release of data next week, but I want it to go to the SEC, and provide more details, before it comes back.

McCall: We had our first meeting a week and a half ago with the WASC Accreditation Task force. We are meeting with the President on October 26 to finalize the type of review that SDSU will request, and from there there'll be multiple conversations. Assuming the type of review we request is the shortened month, there will be multiple conversations about the rest of the year on our SDSU themes, and what we'd like to talk about. I've held several meetings over the last week and a half with individuals from the task force to try and gather the information that we will need in order to then start putting together the review. So, our goal this year for the task force is not to write anything, but rather to ensure that all our policies and procedures are in place, that we have all the information we need going forward, and that we've picked our academic themes.

Provost Ochoa: As we go forward, **Chair Butler Byrd** is on that committee. We're going to recommend doing the theme approach rather than the checkbox approach. We can pick one or

two themes, there's been some discussion about diversity and other factors there, so if anybody in the SEC has things you think are strengths, please send them to Mahdavi McCall because we're trying to get organized so that we can prepare the necessary framework to get that done.

Jerry Shehan: I just wanted to give everyone an update of where we are and where we'll be going next. So on October 10, after converting five million rows worth of record data for our students, we opened my.SDSU for use by faculty, staff and invited students, who had been using it primarily for financial aid, to come back inside the system while we get ready to launch advising month, which will start next month. In the time since we started this transition with faculty and staff having access, we've had 23,000 Logins by about 16,000 distinct users. So, folks are logging into my.SDSU for the first time. We greatly appreciate that, given that this is a new ecosystem for all of us to be learning right now, we have three hundred faculty members who signed up for coaching sessions in labs to get hands-on training associated with the interface.

I also think it's important, since the primary justification for our transition was to remove our financial aid system liability, to acknowledge what we've achieved with our financial aid system, that again, right now processes 428 million dollars of financial aid going to 25,000 students. That's the complexity of what we do.

We're just opening the Cal State apply process for new student admits. And so in the coming week, ~100,000 or so students will be able to log in to my.SDSU to check on their application process.

With the large number of students and faculty and staff who have logged in for the first time, we're seeing a lot of questions about things being different, and things perhaps not being as elegant as they were in old systems. We've got about 200 trouble tickets that have come in. We're trying to respond to each one of those within 4-8 hours, and to make sure that we're engaging, explaining, and also listening to things that might not be apparent to us that users find challenging, so we can build out our Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs), job guides, etc.

So, as a component of those efforts, the next thing that we'll do on Monday is the transition of data from a system called UAchieve which holds our transfer credit student data. We will begin advising month, starting on October 24, and that will allow everyone to have access to full student records at that point. Right now, one of the challenges that we see from both students and from faculty/staff accessing the system is them not being able to see the full record, which was done on purpose as we await transfer credit being inoculated into the system, which will allow us to represent grade levels appropriately, et cetera. So that's the last complex step. Those systems right now are in the process of synchronizing data, and it takes them about four days to do that. So we can validate that data, which likely will mean again, we'll have staff across multiple divisions working into the weekend to make sure that we can be ready for a

launch on a Monday October 24.

We've also worked extensively with our advising cohorts to make sure that tools that they use, like SDSU Navigate as a case in point, and also Uachieve for degree evaluations, are going to be ready to go at the same time in both of those systems. We had to leave behind earlier instances of those systems and basically recreate what we had in order to get that system the right data to talk to Peoplesoft. So, that's a high-level overview of where we are right now and what will happen next week.

Csomay: My question is more from the faculty side. Some of my constituents in my college have been asking questions about user friendliness, and I wonder where could faculty go in the hope and ask questions or make recommendations? For example, ideas about how to make the interface a little bit more user friendly. And, if there's no hope for that, we can just say, okay, this is the way it is, but it would be nice if we could get some input in the interface. For example, I think when you go into the system, you need to click like four times to get to the same kind of information that you used to be able to get with one click, and I think that's the main concern from some of our faculty. So where would people go to put those questions, or those comments forward in the hope that it might change?

Sheehan: Let me first say that you know real work that's been done here has been done by the staff across the functional and technical areas. Uh, they're the folks who have burned the midnight oil, repeatedly. They've not taken vacations to make sure that we reach the deadlines. It's been, you know, my privilege to work with, and in support of, them.

I think it is important to understand about the systems that we had in the past. These systems may have been very comfortable for us because they had been highly customized to us. "Ricks" (the old financial aid system) is actually named for the developer, Rick. The legacy system that was used to pay bills in the university system is called "Ask Scott." It literally was developed by Scott. Both of those systems had one person who had made them exactly the way SDSU wanted them. In order to get the scale that deals with hundreds of thousands of students, and hundreds of millions of dollars of aid, we have to compromise on customizability to get to things that give us scale. That means that the interfaces right now are not as used to us as they had been. That's part of it, but I'd also be mistaken if I didn't say people saw my.SDSU as being clunky in places, and one of the things that we'll be doing over the course of the next year is understanding where those clunky parts are to see what we can change in the user interface without reprogramming the system to make it customizable. So that's the trade off. It is something that we want to make sure that we're listening to.

So, right now, for any input that folks have, they can go to the [my.SDSU website](#), and use the my.sdsu@sdsu.edu email address to provide us with feedback.

There is also the mobile-friendly nature of this system, which our prior systems weren't. There are abilities to create tiles where we can take things that might be more buried, and move them up to things where people are accessing them more, so we do things that we can do, but it's not the sexiest interface in the world. In terms of its ease of use, we want to make sure that we're getting where the rough edges are so we can do customization that we can sustain. We don't want to keep making things so special for us that we have to name them after the person who did them.

Lach: I have two questions. First, is there any update on when the peoplesoft login issue requiring a workaround will be solved, so that we don't have to go to a separate browser in private browsing or incognito. Second, I'm not teaching faculty, but I heavily rely on the class schedule to see the instructors who I'm working with, what section of a class they're in, and that link which I put in chat is broken now, and it looks like it's now buried in my.SDSU. I can certainly put this in an email to the my.SDSU team, but I'm wondering whether there are plans to make that open access, or whether that's now always going to be behind a login screen.

Sheehan: So one of the challenges that we've had is we were seeing inconsistent behavior when people are trying to access the public schedule. We worked to diagnose the issue with the Chancellor's Office. If it's unavailable right now, it's because we have a way of resolving this issue. There will be a publicly available schedule. What essentially was happening is that many users were running into a failure, and then if you reloaded it a second time, you could get to it. So we identified what the root cause was of that glitch and we've been taking care of it. That schedule view also exists for faculty, staff and students in the ability to see the schedule inside, but the public view will continue to be there. We're just working out the complexity of that issue.

The second question that you ask is an interaction between my.SDSU, which is our student system, and then Peoplesoft HR, and they're both Peoplesoft. What's happening is if you log into my.SDSU, and then you don't log out, and you immediately go into our HR system, our HR system says that's not allowed, and it fails until you log back out or clear the cache. So we've got four technical workarounds right now: 1) log out of the student system my.SDSU, 2) go into incognito mode, 3) use a different web browser, but 4) the truth is none of those are really great solutions. So what that's gonna require us to do is basically move the domain that the HR system exists in, and we want to be thoughtful about that, because the absolute hard link in places like sharepoint, our internal references that link is all over the place. So what we don't want to do is move HR to solve the login problem and then disable everything that we've already pointed to, so we're trying to weed that out right now. I'm gonna guess it'll probably take us a number of weeks to do that. But we do think we have a technical solution to that issue. And, we thought it was really important, given that we are coming up on the end of open enrollment, that no one encountered this problem on Thursday, and think that they can't get to

HR, so that's why we did the campus communication broadly on it. We'll work on resolving it.

Kamper: What is the timeline for the previous year schedules being available in terms of, you know, like the old system, used to be able to go back really far and look at the previous schedules. Is that going to be possible with the new schedule, and what's the general timeline for that?

Sheehan: For the class schedule in particular, what we're doing right now is processing the last four years of the class scheduled to move them over to my.SDSU. Those class schedules exist in a test environment to make sure that they look right before we make them live. So folks are waiting to validate those. Which means that, my.SDSU will have five years of that history. If you want to go back more than that five year period, we'll be able to do that, but it'll be through an administrative contact, in fact, so you can get back to those things. But the goal is to move over the last four years. We just need to do data validation there. My guess is it probably hits by the beginning of formal advising month, which would be the 28th of November. I think it will probably take us a few weeks just to make sure that we're not missing anything.

Kamper: I bring it up as a chair. It's helpful for chairs as we're looking at our lecture, hiring and stuff to see what other lecturers taught in the past, et cetera. Thank you.

Baljon: I was just wondering if everything has to be in my.SDSU when you know that system is not as friendly, or if that could be somewhere else, like if every department puts it on our website so that there is another way students can get access to it in order to stop having to do all these clicks.

Sheehan: Departments that still reside inside the university's content management system can pose any subsets of schedules that they would want. For example, we know that computer science does that because one of the things that got brought to our attention when a student thought that there was a data validation error, but it was the fact that there is one special topics course that uses the same course number. So that data does exist, people can continue to publish it in those areas as views, the authoritative schedule needs to be inside of my.SDSU so we have one source of truth. If there are questions about schedules (when things are being offered, etc.) there is that recommendation that SDSU move to a unified information management system was one of the WASC accreditation findings during SDSU's previous review. We must be clear where authoritative sources are.

So again, I note that my.SDSU can be clunky, but I also think we're learning a new system. One of the challenges is, we've taken a campus of experts, where most people know without looking at a keyboard how to do something because it's been done so frequently, and moving everyone back to being novices. It's natural that some of that is going to feel awkward, and some of the interface is awkward. We'll do what we can to improve that user experience. But the source of

data needs to be my.SDSU, or we move into a world where we're not sure what the truth is or where we are right now.

4.5. Associated Students President’s Report (Moore)

Moore: Hello, everyone! Thank you for having me today, and I just have a simple report. Aztecs Rock Hunger has now started, and we are actively announcing the goal of \$100,000 for the food bank, some of which will funnel back to our very own free food pantry that we have in the Student Union. There are multiple ways to donate. One of the biggest ways is on the [Aztec Rocks Hunger website](#).

5. RESOLUTIONS: (FA)(Abel-Mills)

5.1.1. To Increase Number of Awarded Sabbatical Applications.....Page 7

Abel-Mills presents a Senate Resolution to increase the number of sabbaticals the university awards. The Provost and others voice a sense of support for this resolution, especially in terms of how the colleges communicate to faculty about sabbatical applications and the overall process. **Baljon** notes that many who apply don’t get it initially and then give up, and expressed some concern that if all applications get approved, we may see an increase in applications, which may negatively affect the university’s ability to approve all requests.

Motion (**Abel Mills/Vazquez**) to add this item to the Senate Agenda passes by unanimous consent.

6. ACTION ITEMS: UNFINISHED BUSINESS

6.1. Constitution and ByLaws (CBL)(Baljon)

6.1.1. Revise Posting Senate Agendas and Materials Bylaw (2nd reading).....Page 9

Schellenberg made a suggestion to make the following friendly amendment to the proposed policy:13.3 should read “these posted documents,” just so there's no ambiguity. So people don't think they can request confidential materials.

After discussion and motion (**Baljon/Barbone**), the item was added to the November 1, 2022

Senate Agenda by unanimous consent.

6.1.2. CBL Committee Membership (2nd reading).....Page 11

After discussion and motion (**Baljon/Barbone**), the item was added to the November 1, 2022 Senate Agenda by unanimous consent.

7. ACTION ITEMS: NEW BUSINESS

7.1. Academic Policies & Planning (Lach)

7.1.1. Minor Modifications to Existing Undergraduate Courses (AP&P) (Lach).....Page 12

Lach: Currently, all modifications to the curriculum need to go through the full process, per the policy approved at the last Senate meeting. This policy follows the previous updates to provide a partial review process for non-significant updates to curriculum. The proposal includes a list of examples.

Barbone: notes that the process for established courses hoping to be recognized as a GE course or writing course, this approval flow should bypass UCC. **McCall** and **Lach** confirm they can make this change. **Hernandez** asks for the chairs to cross-reference newly passed language and ensure they are in compliance with all of these adjustments in process. Lach assures the body that they will do so.

Csomay asks for the definition of minor changes that result in an abbreviated set of workflow steps to be posted and available on CurricuLog.

Love wants to know if there will be an easy place in the system to denote it is a minor or major change, or will this be vetted by one of the groups. **McCall** says that right now it will be her office, but when they relaunch they can add the option, and the Dean would have the final word, with her office doing some of the vetting as well.

After discussion and motion (**Lach/Barbone**), the item was added to the November 1, 2022 Senate Agenda.

7.2. Committee on Committees and Elections (CCE) (Marx)

7.2.1. Committee Appointments & Vacancies.....Page 15

After discussion and motion (**Marx/Love**), the item, with the note that the version going to the Senate may have updated names and more appointments, was added to the November 1, 2022 Senate Agenda.

7.3. Constitution and ByLaws (CBL)(Baljon)

7.3.1. Review membership & electorate in light of update to bylaws (1st reading).....Page 21

Abel-Mills expressed concern that we are expanding access to a group that has no compensation. Baljon notes that there were more candidates than seats so there is a lot of interest.

Secretary Fuller shares that this was discussed and debated and the decision was made to allow lectures to run and participate without limit as they see fit. We didn't want to take the opportunity away from those who wanted it. There is a commitment from the lecturer contingency to research and advocate for lecturer compensation.

Lach: Can we move the reference to "etc." under auxiliary employees?

Fuller: The four that should be listed are Research Foundation, Aztec Shops, Associated Students and the Campanile Foundation. **Baljon** accepts this as a friendly edit.

After discussion and motion (**Baljon/Barbone**), the item was added to the November 1, 2022 Senate Agenda as a first reading.

7.4. Committee on Diversity, Equity & Inclusion (DEI)(Hernández)

7.4.1. Request vote to confirm AY 2022-23 DEI Agenda.....Page 25

After discussion and motion (**Hernandez/Vasquez**), the item was added to the November 1, 2022 Senate Agenda.

7.5. President’s Budget Advisory Committee (PBAC)(Wong-Nickerson)

- 7.5.1. Request to clarify the Senate & elected membership of the PBAC committee.....Page 26

Baljon: the phrase “limited to one per college” should only apply to faculty. **Secretary Fuller** accepts this as a friendly edit and notes the draft brought to the Senate will include the requested change.

After discussion and motion (**Fuller/Barbone**), the item was added to the November 1, 2022 Senate Agenda.

7.6. Staff Affairs Committee (SA)(Rehuss)

- 7.6.1. Proposed Changes to align Emeritus staff policies with Emeritus faculty and administrators.....Page 28

After a presentation by Senator **Rehuss**, this proposal was discussed and returned to the Staff Affairs Committee so that we ensure these suggested updates do not interfere with the existing consultative process with unions, and so the committee can confer with AP&P on suggested changes, and to perhaps combine these changes with the existing policy changes being worked on in AP&P that relate to Emeritus Status.

The item will be returned to the SEC once cleared by HR and the consultative process with AP&P is complete.

7.7. Change to the Senate Policy File section focused on the SGC Vice Chair

Secretary Fuller presents the updated policy on behalf of Janet Castro, Chair of the Student Grievance Committee. This new policy outlines an update to the Student Grievance Committee charter to allow for and define the role of a Vice-Chair. Motion (**Fuller/Hernandez**) passes by unanimous consent.

8. INFORMATION ITEMS

It is noted that UCC and Graduate Council each need to submit their own Action and

Information Items, and that Action and Information Items require separate memos.

It is noted that some of the curriculum information items listed are actually Action Items, so a motion is made (**Barbone/Fuller** for undergraduate items & **Love/** for graduate items) and these items are added to the Senate Agenda by unanimous consent.

Baljon presented the information item and asked for feedback on who should be allowed to represent SDSU in ASCSU. Explained there was some discussion about being inclusive of all contingent faculty is more equitable, while allowing only teaching based (lecturer) contingent faculty to serve because that is the focus of ASCSU. **Secretary Fuller** argues that the Senate body has the ability to determine the best representatives for SDSU, and there is no need to purposefully exclude any faculty member. **Hernandez** echoes the stance of Fuller.

8.1. Academic Policies & Planning (AP&P)(Lach)

8.1.1. Math readiness and precarity / Math equity gaps.....Page

8.2. Constitution and ByLaws (CBL)(Baljon)

8.2.1. ASCSU Senate Representation.....Page

8.3. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC)(Barbone)

8.3.1. 500-level Courses (UCC)(GC)(Barbone)(Love).....Page

8.3.2. Undergraduate Courses.....Page

8.3.3. Undergraduate Programs.....Page

8.4. Graduate Council (GC)(Love)

8.4.1. Graduate Courses.....Page

8.4.2. Graduate Programs.....Page

8.5. General Education Program (GE)(Wilson)

8.5.1.	General Education Program.....	Page
8.6.	Professional Studies of Fine Arts (PSFA)(Canary)	
8.6.1.	BA Degree in Centinela State Prison.....	Page
	[TIME CERTAIN: 4:00 PM]	
8.7.	Undergraduate Council (UC)(Brooks)	
8.7.1.	Report on Undergraduate Council business.....	Page
8.8.	University Relations and Development (URAD) (Vargas).....	Page

9. ADJOURN

Motion (**Fuller/**) to adjourn at 4pm passes by unanimous consent.

Chair Butler Byrd acknowledges that ahead of the motion to adjourn, a formal motion was not made to move these information items to the Senate Agenda for the 11/1/22 meeting, she will communicate to SEC members and pull any item to which a member objects.