I. Call to Order and Roll Call:

II. Approval of Minutes:
   Senate Minutes of December 12, 2016

III. Communications and Questions:
   A. From the Chair of the Senate
   
   B. From the President

IV. State of the University Announcements:
   A. Vice President for Student Affairs
   B. Associated Students President
   C. Vice President for University Advancement
   D. Statewide Academic Senators
   E. Provost
   F. Vice President for Administration and Finance

V. Executive Committee Report:
   A. Minutes of the Executive Committee –
      Executive Committee Minutes of November 28, 2016
      Executive Committee Minutes of December 5, 2016
      Executive Committee Minutes of January 11, 2017
      Executive Committee Minutes of January 30, 2017
   
   B. Consent Calendar –
      Consent Calendar of February 13, 2017

   C. Executive Committee Action Items –
      Senate Calendar for 2017-2018

VI. New Business:
   A. Strategic Planning Discussion

VII. Unfinished Business:

VIII. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation)
   A. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
      AS 1644, Policy Recommendation, Final Examinations, Evaluations,
      or Culminating Activities Policy (Final Reading)
B. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
   AS 1633, Policy Recommendation, Adopting New SOTE and SOLATE Instruments (Final Reading)

   AS 1643, Policy Recommendation, Amendment C to S15-6, Appointment of Regular Faculty Employees; Consideration for Early Tenure for Previously Tenured Faculty (First Reading)

C. Organization and Government Committee (O&G)
   AS 1645, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds S82-10 and F86-7 Pertaining to Technology-Related Advisory Boards (Final Reading)

   AS 1642, Policy Recommendation, Change in membership, Charge, and Category for the Student Success Committee (Final Reading)

   AS 1635, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to S16-8, Selection and Review of Administrators (First Reading)

D. University Library Board (ULB):

E. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
   AS 1641, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy S16-14, Clarification of ‘Internship’ (Final Reading)

IX. Special Committee Reports:

X. Adjournment:
The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Forty-Six Senators were present.

Ex Officio:
- Present: Kimbarow, Van Selst, Lee, Pérea, Sabalius
- Absent: None

CASA Representatives:
- Present: Schultz-Krohn, Shifflett, Grosvenor, Sen, Lee
- Absent: None

Administrative Representatives:
- Present: Faas, Blaylock, Feinstein
- Absent: Papazian

COB Representatives:
- Present: Reade, Rodan, Campsey
- Absent: None

Deans:
- Present: Stacks, Jacobs, Schutten
- Absent: Green

EDUC Representatives:
- Present: Laker, Mathur
- Absent: None

Students:
- Present: Balal, Spica, Tran, Medrano, Medina
- Absent: Caesar

ENGR Representatives:
- Present: Chung, Sullivan-Green
- Absent: Hamedi-Hagh

H&A Representatives:
- Present: Frazier, Grindstaff,
  Riley, Miller, Khan
- Absent: Ormsbee

Emeritus Representative:
- Present: Buzanski
- Absent: None

SCI Representatives:
- Present: White, Cargill, Boekema
- Absent: Kaufman

Honorary Representative:
- Present: None
- Absent: Lessow-Hurley

SOS Representatives:
- Present: Peter, Wilson, Curry
- Absent: Trulio, Hart

General Unit Representatives:
- Present: Matoush, Higgin, Trousdale, Kauppila
- Absent: None

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes—
The minutes of November 21, 2016 were approved as amended by Senator Sabalius (45-0-0).

III. Communications and Questions –
A. From the Chair of the Senate—
Chair Kimbarow thanked the Senators and members of the Executive Committee for their support and hard work this year.

The constitutional amendment to remove the VP of University Advancement from
the Senate was approved by the faculty in a campus-wide vote (108-8-1). This amendment will now be sent to the President for signature.

Chair Kimbarow clarified that Senators Lee and Riley were not applying for the Chief Operations Manager position under the Provost updates section, but are being considered as Executive Committee faculty representatives on the internal search committee.

Chair Kimbarow announced that the university had forwarded Senator Sabalius’ nomination for Faculty Trustee to the ASCSU. The Senate thanked Senator Sabalius and wished him luck.

**B. From the President—No report.**

**IV. Executive Committee Report –**

**A. Executive Committee Minutes –**

EC Minutes of November 14, 2016 – No questions.

**B. Consent Calendar –**

The consent calendar of November 21, 2016 as amended by AVC Schultz-Krohn to add Susan Murphy to the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility was approved (45-0-0).

**C. Executive Committee Action Items:**

**V. New Business – None**

**VI. Unfinished Business: None**

**VII. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items. In rotation.**

**A. Organization and Government Committee (O&G) –**

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1639, Policy Recommendation, Modification of Senate Bylaw 4.1, Senate Executive Committee Membership (Final Reading).*  
*AS 1639 passed as written (39-1-3).*

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1621, Policy Recommendation, Department Voting Rights (Final Reading).*

Questions:

Q: This policy seems very clunky at best. It is redundant and has repetition, and whereas clauses are all over the place. Couldn’t this policy go back to the committee and be cleaned up?

A: O&G is confident that we have moved this from an original draft to a place where
it can be implemented and confident this is a good time for a final reading.

Q: On line 28, how large a resource are we talking about, who will provide the resource, and does the university have sufficient funds to provide the resource?
A: This calls for the administration in consultation with the Senate to investigate the options. There are some financially-feasible options. There are some non-subscription-based options as well that are well within our means.

Q: In section 5.1, it says department chairs have full voting rights in the department as long as they are chair, then in section 5.2 it says faculty assigned as interim or acting chair for a department do not have full voting rights in that department is that correct?
A: If you are looking at the grey sheet with modifications there may be a mistake. The intent is that the interim/acting chair has full voting rights in the department they chair and their home department.

**Debate:**

Comment: Current policy (F02-4) allows lecturers to vote on curricular matters. This policy proposal limits what lecturers are permitted to vote on. If there hasn’t been curricular degradation for the past decade and a half, I don’t see why cutting the vote would add to it.

Comment: UCCD acknowledges the work of the O&G committee on this policy, however, a number of members on UCCD think the policy needs more work in terms of clarity. Clarity could be improved by revising the sequencing of the information, correcting for the contributions, and simplifying the policy. UCCD would like to encourage the committee to consider this and at this point the UCCD does not support the policy. UCCD does not support voting rights for lecturers on curricular issues primarily because of their appointment. This is not a statement that the UCCD does not value the input of lecturers. UCCD absolutely does. The concern is the nature of the appointment. Lecturer appointments do not include any responsibility for committee work or attending faculty meetings. When you are asking people to vote, you cannot be sure these will be informed votes since they aren’t required. This has to do with the university assignment of workload.

Senator Stacks made a motion to refer back to committee. The motion was seconded. Senator Lee (James) made an amendment to the motion to refer back to committee to add **instructions as follows, “To revisit UCCD to discuss, revise, and clarify the policy.”** The Lee amendment to the Stacks motion passed (26-9-4). The Senate voted on the Stacks motion as amended by Senator Lee and the motion passed (25-11-0). [AS 1621 was referred back to the committee with instructions.]

Senator Shifflett presented **AS 1638, Policy Recommendation, Bylaw 2.2, Pertaining to Term Length for Senate Chair (Final Reading).**

For 20 years the Senate has elected Chairs for one year and then re-elected him/her to
serve a second year. This proposal would make the chair’s term an elected 2-year term and would provide stability to the Senate Office, strengthen the position of the Chair, and also allow sufficient time for the Senate Chair to learn the multitude of tasks involved in leading the Senate.

Questions:
Q: We once had a chair that believed that any divisive issue could be reconciled through lengthy discussion by the Senate. During the year he was chair virtually nothing was accomplished, and no policies were passed. What do you do about the one foul apple?
A: We do have the ability to remove the Senate Chair from their position.

Q: Would the committee consider having the Vice Chair term still be a 1-year renewable term?
A: Interesting. The committee did not discuss this.

Debate:

Comments:

I oppose this bylaw change. I was a Senate Chair. It is very difficult to judge the caliber and competence of the Senate Chair at the very beginning of their Vice Chair term. The way the one-plus-one term works, the Senate gets to reaffirm its desire to keep the chair in place and the reaffirmation comes exactly half way through the five years that a Vice Chair/Chair/Past Chair serves. Basically, you have one vote that elects someone for 5 years. Under the one-plus-one rule, after they’ve completed their first semester as Senate Chair, you will have seen them in office for one and a half years, and will have a base of knowledge as to whether we want to keep them for a second year as chair. It is a good system of checks and balances.

It seems that it has never been a problem when a chair wanted to stay and has ran for a second year. We have never voted any Vice Chair out as well, so I speak against this policy.

I will just point out to the body that after 20 years, it is time to revisit this bylaw. In the past 20 years no chair has been denied a second year, but requiring a chair to be re-elected for the second year does not allow for advance department planning in either the Senate Office or the chair’s home department. A 2-year term also gives the chair more credibility with the administration and allows better planning for the administration as well.

The Senate voted and AS 1638 was defeated (16-20-2).

Senator Shifflett presented AS 1642, Policy Recommendation, Change in Membership and Charge of the Student Success Committee (First Reading).
This change would reconstitute the Student Success Committee as a special agency, reduce the membership from 20 to 11, and give the group a more action-oriented role.

Questions:

Q: Could you please clarify what this means operationally, because now you are moving the Student Success Committee out from under the policy committees and making it a special agency?
A: Even though it is changed to a special agency it could still report to the I&SA Committee. Everything about a special agency is dictated by the policy that brought them into being. We can make sure that the reporting line to I&SA stays in place.

Q: Why is the committee membership mainly administrators and staff with very few faculty, when faculty are in charge of student success on campus?
A: The committee talked this through at length. The people that are in charge of initiatives and taking responsibility for implementation are administrators. This group needs to hear from and have a conduit for faculty to bring faculty information to the group, however, the three faculty seats are meant to represent the campus faculty voice on the committee. O&G discussed this and wanted a smaller committee that could be action oriented which is why the membership was set at 11.

Q: Has the committee thought about having a smaller subset of the committee become the policy drafting committee? That way the policy recommendation might remain in a majority of faculty control?
A: I’m a big fan of this. This committee can split off subgroups as needed.

Q: I would like to see additional faculty members and students on this committee including graduate students as well.
A: The committee will consider it.

Q: Has the committee consulted with the UCCD on the charge?
A: No, not yet. I will take this back to the committee.

Q: Will the AS representative still serve on this committee?
A: AS makes recommendations for students to serve on policy and operating committees. AS would still make a recommendation for students to serve on this committee.
Q: There are 4 spaces for students right now and I’d recommend this be kept.
A: Thank you.

Q: I’d like to suggest that O&G compare the charge of I&SA with the charge listed here to make sure there is no overlap. In particular, on line 76 it says, “this committee recommends changes to academic policies. Policies at this university are something the Senate passes and the President signs. I don’t like the idea of possible confusion that there is an alternative recommending body for policies other than I&SA.
A: We will clarify this. We meant for this committee to make a recommendation to
the parent committee as it is done now.

Q: This is not a replacement of I&SA?
A: No, currently there is a Student Success Committee that reports to I&SA, this
committee will become a special agency and be much smaller.
Q: One of my concerns with the small number of faculty on the committee and the
number of disciplines on campus is that all faculty will not be represented as well as
they currently are on I&SA. I’m glad to hear that Student Success will still report to
I&SA.
A: That won’t be changed.

B. University Library Board (ULB) – None.

C. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) –
Senator Mathur presented AS 1641, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to
University Policy S16-14, Clarification of Internship (First Reading). This
amendment is needed to clarify when UOAs are needed for internships or service
learning activity. A UOA is needed when the university or department is making the
placement. If a student finds the internship on their own, then a UOA is not needed.
It also requires the university to have one vetted option for these students who are
taking the internships. If a course is an elective course, then no UOA is required. The
learning outcomes need to be specified on the learning plan, and the learning plan is
now required to be provided to the site of the employer. All the processes are going to
be transferred out of the Office of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs and over to
the Office of Student and Faculty Success where the Center for Community Learning
and Leadership is now housed. It is also noted in the financial impact statement that
there is an increased need for staff.

Questions:
Q: Has the committee considered having separate course numbers for those
internships that require a university placement?
A: We haven’t considered it, but will.

Q: On line 75, can you explain what it means to provide at least one option? If a
department has 50 different options, one of which has been vetted, but a student takes
that option first then another student comes along and that option is closed, does the
department have to provide an option with an opening, or just provide the option?
A: The department does not have to provide a list of 50 options, because if the
department provides a list of 50 options then each of them will require a UOA.

Q: When the EO came out we all needed the UOA. The argument was that it was a
risk management issue, so how did the risk go away?
A: We are one of the first campuses creating the policy and UOAs, and in the process
risk management is learning what their liability is. As a couple other campuses have
come on line with their policies, we have determined we don’t need to go as far as we
had been with our UOAs.

**Q:** I’m excited to see we won’t have to have all these UOAs. In my department no law enforcement agency would sign a UOA. I’m concerned about line 71 where it says at least one option for students where the university makes the placement, because I can’t think of a single internship in my department where they would allow us to put students without them vetting the student first. We have background checks for most of our placements, and we have a selection based on interviews with the student. I’m wondering if the committee would consider some other option, perhaps a substitute course that doesn’t require a UOA to get students credit for required internships?

**A:** The committee will discuss this in light of this particular issue. Departments can always substitute a course for another course. We will clarify this.

**Q:** How can the department be sure that an internship the student finds on their own is the same quality as say an internship the department has used before and knows is a quality placement?

**A:** You should use the same process you used prior to UOAs to determine the quality of the internships. Departments can also decide to use UOAs if they wish to.

**D. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) – None.**

**E. Professional Standards Committee (PS) – None.**

**VIII. State of the University Announcements. Questions. In rotation.**

**A. Associated Students President –**

On November 9, 2016, AS passed a resolution to recognize Indigenous People’s Day on campus. AS recently formed student groups to be a part of that day if SJSU and the CSU follow-through. Hopefully, by the beginning of next semester President Perea will have more information for the Senate.

AS endorses SS-F16-1, Reaffirming San José State University's Commitment to an Inclusive Campus Climate and our Determination to Provide a Safe, Supportive, and Welcoming Community. President Perea asked for clarification as to what “standing in solidarity with students” meant in the resolution. AS is concerned that their version of “in solidarity” may be different from that of the faculty.

**B. Vice President for University Advancement – None**

**C. CSU Statewide Senators –**

Former Chancellor Charles Reed passed away this week.

The community colleges changed the prerequisites for math courses which will impact transfers, because now a course without a prerequisite of Algebra can quality
a student to take Statistics. Certain disciplines such as Business and Economics haven’t had a chance to go back and review those courses yet. The process is being fixed, but particularly for those disciplines that really require Algebra, they should speak to their chairs about this.

D. Provost –
The College of Education Dean Search Committee will be charged tomorrow. The Provost hopes to have a new dean in place by July 1, 2017.

In January 2017 a search will begin for a new AVP of Student Success.

The Provost and his team have been working on 2017/2018 Enrollment Plan. You may have heard that the Chancellor’s Office has told us not to plan for any enrollment growth next year. We can only replace the graduated and non-retained students. We expect to graduate 8,600 students this year and we have another 2,500 students on leave, studying abroad, or non-retained. We have a lot of transition on campus. We plan to enroll 8,000 new undergraduate and 2,000 new graduate students next year. This will be one of the largest incoming classes of students of all time at SJSU. There are some concerns such as by drastically improving graduation rates, we are up 40% from last year, we will dramatically increase the throughput of our students on our campus. As we approach a 35% graduation rate say by 2025, what does that mean to the campus as far as how many incoming freshmen, transfer, and graduate students are we going to need to backfill for so many students graduating. Also, what will this mean to our orientation, first-year experience, and first-year classes, as well as alumni relations, etc. We are also concerned about non-enrollment. What we are seeing since the presidential election is that there is a significant drop-off in international student applications. We have a growth plan to get us to about 15% international students on the campus by 2021 and this plan is in jeopardy with the recent events that have occurred. The Provost and his team are working to address this, but it is a definite concern for the campus.

You may have heard there is a degree completion scholarship pilot going on next summer. The Provost and his team have identified 800 eligible students that without intervention would most likely graduate in 4 ½ years from five departments including Business Administration, CHAD, Journalism, Justice Studies and Psychology. The Provost and his team are going to help these students graduate in 4 years by providing scholarships to take up to six units in the summer.

Questions:
Q: (Senator Sabalius) “I have heard that Chancellor White plans on coming out with a statement that 3-unit courses are the norm in the CSU, is this true?”
A: (Provost Feinstein) “I have not heard that and neither has anyone in my team.”
Q: (Senator Sabalius) “It came out from Undergraduate Studies.”
A: (Deputy Provost Kemnitz) “I read something to that effect in some minutes, but I have not heard anything.”
Q: (Senator Khan) “How will the California Promise affect priority registration and what numbers are we looking at?”
A: (Provost Feinstein) “There are a couple California Promises out there and one is about free tuition for community college. Is that what you are talking about?”
Q: (Senator Khan) “No, priority registration.”
A: (Provost Feinstein) “We are trying to be one of the campuses that adopt this in the first phase because we think that anything we can focus on students getting their mind set on 15 units a semester gets them a 4-year degree. The challenge with that version of California Promise is that everybody is on priority registration, so what does that mean? We are really struggling with what priority registration is and how it impacts all our students. We really haven’t vetted this completely. This is something we are working on.”
A: (Deputy Provost Kemnitz) “A referral was made to the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee.”
A: (Provost Feinstein) “We are one of the first to want to participate in this, but we haven’t been informed of all the expectations of that program yet.”
Q: (Senator Shifflett) “Can you let us know where we are with respect to the number of applications vs the 8,000 spots?”
A: (Provost Feinstein) “VP Blaylock can share the actual number of students that have applied.”
Q: (Senator Laker) “Could you and VP Blaylock share with the body what has led to the increase in graduation rates?”
A: (Provost Feinstein) “It is really hard to say because we have 20 to 30 student success initiatives going on simultaneously. We will have a new version of our Four Pillars of Success coming out in January.”
Q: (Senator Peter) “With regard to the degree completion scholarships, why were those five particular departments targeted?”
A: (Provost Feinstein) “Our research indicated that these five departments were where most of the students that would graduate in 4 ½ years were coming from.”
Q: (Senator Peter) “Should more departments be considering offering additional summer classes to accommodate the summer scholarships, or just those five departments?”
A: (Deputy Provost Kemnitz) “Upper division GE is likely to be needed by those students.” Deputy Provost Kemnitz will get back to the Senate with details.

E. Vice President of Finance and Administration –
Faculty will be moved back into DMH in January. The Fire Marshal will inspect the building tomorrow.

Security is number one on VP Faas’ priority list. Last week the Executive Committee had a ½ day active shooter exercise.

As of this afternoon, we will be stopping all big noise construction for a week to a week and a half for finals. In addition, all lawn mowing and leaf blowing will stop for two weeks.
Questions:

(Senator Sabalius) “I read we hired a new football coach and I’m curious what his total compensation is, but I won’t ask because that could be seen as a provocation. I know that the previous coach earned more than $500,000 and is being paid for the entire year while he isn’t even working.”

(Senator Laker) “When former Interim President Martin hired a coach that had used homophobic slurs in the past she vouched for this person and said that remedies would be taken and I asked her what remedies/training was he given and she was supposed to get back to us but did not. I’m bringing it up again because these kind of things happen and there is no follow-up to ensure structures are in place to prevent them happening again.”

(VP Faas) “Okay.”

Chair Kimbarow announced that he had been privileged to be a part of the interviewing and hiring of the new football coach and he was confident that the university made an excellent selection. Chair Kimbarow was impressed with how many of the coach’s former students came out in support of him. VP Blaylock commented that the new coach’s Dad played football for SJSU, and his Mom was a student at SJSU as well.

F. Vice President for Student Affairs –

VP Blaylock announced the “Just in Time” mobile food truck was on campus today. In November the mobile food truck broke down on the way to the campus, but today the truck was here early. The truck arrived at 8 a.m. and they began serving students at 10 a.m. VP Blaylock and the 58 volunteers served 637 students today.

IX. Special Committee Reports – None

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 4:44 p.m.
Executive Committee Meeting
November 28, 2016
12-1:30 pm ADM 167

Present: Kimbarow, Peter, Shifflett, Schultz-Krohn, Mathur, Frazier, Lee, Kaufman, Riley, Faas, Feinstein
Absent: Papazian, Blaylock, Lanning, Peréa

1. The minutes of 11-14-16 were approved as amended by Senator Mathur (11-0-0).

2. The consent calendar 11-28-16 was approved (11-0-0).

3. Updates:
   a. From the Provost:
      The new Dean of the College of Engineering, Sheryl Erhman, will be here July 1, 2017.

      The new Dean of the College of Business, Dan Moshavi, will be here at the end of February 2017.

      A search for the new Dean of the College of Education will begin right away.

      The position description for the CIO has been drafted. The search process is underway, and the President hopes to have someone onboard by the end of July. Several suggestions were made regarding candidates for the CIO position including having someone with an academic and IT background. Another suggestion was made to remove “compliance officer” from the name.

      The Provost needs more time to review policies and prepare his recommendations for the President. It can take up to ten days for the Provost to do everything he needs to do. The Provost only has a one-hour a week meeting with the President and cannot spend all of it discussing policies. A suggestion was made to have the administrators that sit on the policy committees report to the Provost whenever a new policy or amendment is being discussed to get the Provost’s feedback during the first reading.

   b. The AVP of FDO search ended with a fantastic candidate. However, we were unable to close the hire. There is another good candidate, but if that person does not work a new search will be conducted.
c. Hoover Hall will be coming down soon and there will be some construction noise.

d. DMH is almost finished and a packing and moving schedule will be sent out soon.

e. The head football coach has been released. A search committee will be formed soon. The committee discussed the buyout of the coach’s contract. This will be paid by the Tower Foundation.

4. Selection and Review of Administrators:
The committee discussed the procedures for the selection and review of deans. There are issues with small departments. The committee discussed possibly having an election for two chairs, and then three additional faculty members from anywhere. There is no procedure for the Provost to remove a member if need be.

5. The meeting adjourned at 1:33 p.m.
Executive Committee Meeting  
December 5, 2016  
12-1:30, ADM 167

Present: Peter, Shifflett, Schultz-Krohn, Mathur, Frazier, Lee, Riley, Feinstein, Peréa, Blaylock, Faas

Absent: Papazian, Lanning, Kaufman, Kimbarow

1. Approval of 11/28/16 meeting minutes - Not available for review.

2. Consent Calendar - No new appointees.

3. Review of nominee for Board of Trustees faculty position  
Discussion regarding the nominee from SJSU  
Vote: 10-0-0 to move the nominee from SJSU forward

4. Strategic Planning Steering Committee update:  
This committee met last Monday and divided into five subgroups to address the status of  
the strategic goals of 2017 by soliciting information across the campus. Information will  
be distributed across the campus regarding the accomplishment of the strategic goals over  
the course of time.

Close the loop regarding the strategic plan and looking to the future as a new strategic  
plan is developed, includes outcome assessment of the 2017 strategic plan goals to guide  
formulation of new strategic plan.

Important to validate and celebrate the accomplishments in working towards the goals  
2017.

The 2017 strategic plan and the four pillars of Student Success will be discussed during  
the Senate Retreat on Jan 27, 2017.

Discussion should include an explanation of how the strategic plan is useful in meeting  
the mission of SJSU.

5. Selection and review of administrators  
O & G is deliberating the policy recommendation.  
O & G committee members are concerned about how to address the issue of insuring  
diversity of committee membership.  
Considerations are being made for a combination of elected members and appointed  
members to look at committee membership as a means to address diversity.  
Concerns about potential issues of membership behavior and expectations of members.
Consider having the faculty elect seven faculty from the college and then the Executive Committee selects five from the seven to serve. Policy currently is silent regarding the distribution of faculty across the departments within the college.

6. Communication during policy-making/revision:
Communication among administrators and policy committees should occur prior to the first reading and between the first and second reading.

7. Policy committee updates:
   a. C&R –
      i. Revisiting the internship policy as additional information has been received from the Chancellor’s office since the policy was passed. A UOA is only needed when the university makes the placement, if the student is making the internship arrangements without the university input no UOA is needed. If students are finding their own placement they still need to complete a self-statement form; request to keep this information held within the department. If the internship is an elective course, then no UOA is needed. The revised policy recommendation should be the first reading at the next senate meeting.
      ii. Department name change – need for departments to go through the Dean’s office for potential name change. C&R has a current referral regarding department name changes.
   b. ISA – No report
   c. O&G –
      Previous issues discussed for selection and review of administrators.
   d. PS –
      Policy replacement on privacy of electronic information; there is a UC system policy that is being used as a framework to move a new policy forward.

8. Updates
   a. Associated Students – Alternative Spring Break – change in dates for event to occur after the Spring semester is finished; AS House has a light show; strategic planning is being addressed by AS; public forum for students addressing tuition fees; discussion of what does it mean to “stand in solidarity” for the AS 1636.
   b. VP Student Affairs – admissions for freshmen and transfer students is up from last year; mobile food pantry saw significant increases.

These minutes were taken and transcribed by AVC Winifred Schultz-Krohn on December 5, 2016. The minutes were edited by Chair Kimbarow on December 19, 2016. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on January 11, 2017.
Executive Committee Meeting  
January 11, 2017  
12-1:30, ADM 167


Absent: Papazian, Blaylock, Riley, Pérea

1. The minutes of November 28, 2016 were approved as amended by Senator Kaufman.

2. The minutes of December 5, 2016 were approved as amended by Senator Mathur.

3. Updates:
   a. Provost:
      Priorities for 2017 include; student success and updating the four pillars plan, updating Vision 2017, looking at ethnic studies on campus, getting the undocumented student center setup possibly in the Student Union, transitioning the African-American Taskforce to something more permanent, and how to connect our health and human services programs with the local community.

   b. Chief Diversity Officer (CDO):
      Priorities for 2017 include; advising on issues that arise, working with the Faculty Diversity Committee, establishing a two hour faculty diversity and Title IX presentation during the faculty orientation, working with Amy Strage on a Faculty-in-Residence program, consulting with search committees, Natalie Potts is the new Title IX Officer and has been essential in helping the CDO.

      There is a heavy volume of cases on campus right now. The majority involve stalking or intoxication. Most of the cases are student-on-student.

4. The committee discussed and selected nominees to recommend to the President for the CIO Search Committee. The Provost will ask the President for recommendations for the community member on the search committee and the Executive Committee will discuss via email later this week.

5. The committee discussed the Institute for Sport, Society and Social Change. The Provost is drafting an ORU proposal to submit to C&R/Graduate Studies and Research for review and approval. It was recommended that the Provost work with AVP Stacks. The idea is to bring faculty and students together to work jointly.
6. The meeting adjourned at 1:37 p.m.

These minutes were taken and transcribed by AVC Winifred Schultz-Krohn on December 5, 2016. The minutes were edited by Chair Kimbarow on December 19, 2016. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on January 11, 2017.
Executive Committee Meeting  
January 30, 2017  
12-1:30, ADM 167

Present: Peter, Shifflett, Schultz-Krohn, Mathur, Frazier, Lee, Feinstein, Faas, Kaufman, Kimbarow, Riley, Blaylock, Papazian

Absent: Perea, Wong(Lau)

1. The minutes of January 11, 2017 were approved (13-0-0).

2. Updates:
   a. From the President:
      President Papazian thanked Vice Chair Stef Frazier for an excellent Senate Retreat.

      The Executive Order passed by President Trump has created a lot of confusion.
      This order impacts faculty, staff, and students. Large, elite institutions are the most
      hurt by the Executive Order. The best advice is to stay put, and for those who must
      travel to look carefully at where you are going.

      When President Papazian reviews new policies for approval, she asks herself if the
      policy is a bandaid or a resolution of the problem. She also asks if it is a real issue
      or arose as a result of something that happened to someone and resulted in a policy
      and are there unintended consequences. President Papazian will not sign away her
      authority to someone else for something that she is accountable for. The Provost
      has asked the administrators on the various policy committees to report to the
      leadership team on these policies in detail during the first readings. President
      Papazian and Chair Kimbarow discussed the launch event for the Institute of Sport,
      Activism and Social Change.

   b. From the Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs/Provost:
      Provost Feinstein had a meeting with CASA Chairs and Directors and the Dean to
      discuss how we can create synergies in the fields of health on campus. Chairs and
      Directors of CASA are working on a paper describing the current and
      recommended structure and name of the college.

      After an internal search, Cami Johnson has been appointed Chief Operations
      Manager to the Provost. She is currently working on several projects, including
      supporting the Strategic Planning Advisory Committee.

   c. From the Vice President of Administration and Finance (VPAF):
      There was a fire in the South Garage on Saturday night. It was deliberately started
      under one of our trucks. There are too many levels in the garage and hidden spaces
to have cameras all over. However, UPD is planning to put cameras at the entrances/exits of the garages so they can see when someone enters and leaves the garage.

There would be many advantages to locating the proposed BART station to downtown. It would benefit our students and faculty and will help eliminate some transportation problems.

The DMH Building repairs have been completed. Faculty and staff have been very happy with the work. Work on the MLK Library may be next.

d. From the Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA):
The mobile food pantry served 568 students today.

Admission numbers for freshmen are down by seven applications, transfer applicants are up by 519, and graduate applicants are up by 400 to 500. DeAnza Community College sends the most students by far to SJSU.

3. The meeting adjourned at 1:37 p.m.
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<td>Executive Committee Meeting (12:1:30 p.m.)</td>
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POLICY RECOMMENDATION
Adopting New SOTE and SOLATE Instruments

Resolved: That the attached documents following be adopted as the text for revised Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTE) and Student Opinion of Laboratory Teaching Effectiveness (SOLATE) questionnaires; be it further
Resolved: That this become effective for the administration of all SOTEs and SOLATEs as soon as practicable.

Rationale: F12-6, Evaluation in Effectiveness in Teaching for all Faculty, states:

SERB shall prepare the specific questions and survey instrument to be used to measure student opinions of teaching effectiveness. It shall decide the scale, format, and layout of the instrument, and determine the information that is provided in the reports generated by the surveys. The instrument shall be approved by the Senate upon recommendation of SERB and the Professional Standards Committee, and may only be amended by SERB.

SERB is a board specifically appointed for expertise on survey research and contains the AVP for IEA as an advisor. Professional Standards and the Senate may accept or reject the survey instruments provided by SERB, but may not amend the text of the survey instrument.

For the rationale explaining the changes to the questions in the SOTE and SOLATE instrument, Professional Standards refers you to the version of this policy passed by the Senate on October 24, 2016, which was itself a modified version of a proposal returned to committee by the Senate on May 9, 2016. The October 24 policy recommendation was returned by the President without signature with several concerns expressed. This rationale is restricted to addressing those concerns:

1) There was a typographical error in numbering the questions; this has been corrected.
2) There was a minor discrepancy in the phrasing of the open ended questions on the SOTE and SOLATE. This has been corrected.
3) There was concern about the new language in the SOTE/SOLATE instructions indicating that the instrument is not designed to provide feedback “on your instructor’s physical appearance.” This was added at the request of instructors who have received inappropriate feedback about their attractiveness and other variables that are either outside of their control and/or inappropriate for comment on the professional evaluation of their work—in some cases bordering on a kind of anonymous harassment. SERB conducted a review of appropriate literature and found that these instructions may be helpful in addressing a known gender bias in student evaluations (MacNell, Driscoll, & Hunt, 2015) and are unlikely to introduce
unconscious bias (e.g., Duguid & Hunt 2015). Furthermore, since the teaching
evaluation policy (F12-6) lists “comments on personal appearance” among those
items that are inappropriate and that may be removed prior to placement in the
personnel file, it is in the interest of the University to prevent such comments from
being recorded in the first place.

4) There was a question about how the data collected from the existing (unchanged)
informational question on “undue influence” is used. This is a matter that falls
within the teaching evaluation policy’s charge (F12-6) that “Additional technical and
implementation details not covered in this policy will be decided by the AVP for IEA
in consultation with SERB and the Professional Standards Committee.” The
current procedure is that this information is released only on the request of
Department Chairs or the faculty member. Typically, such requests only occur
when students make independent allegations of improprieties related to the SOTEs
and an investigation is conducted.

Professional Standards endorses these changes and reminds the Senate that these
revisions are now in their third year of Senate review. The last time the instruments were
changed was in 2004.

Approved: 1/30/2017
Vote: 9--0-1

Present: Peter, Green, White, Lee, Reade, Kauppila, Caesar, Hamedi-Hagh, Caesar,
Hwang

Absent: None

Approved by the Student Evaluation Review Board 1/25/2017
Vote: 6-0-0
Present: Slusser, Venkatsubramany, Smith, Lee, Eirinaki, Heil
Absent: Strage

Financial Impact: No changes over the previous policy.

Workload Impact: Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics (IEA) will need to update the
online questionnaires.
Instructions

This instrument is designed to be a professional evaluation of your instructor's teaching performance. It is NOT designed to measure your reaction to the subject, the facilities (such as the physical conditions of the classroom), or your instructor's physical appearance. Your individual ratings will be anonymous and a summary of items 1-18 will be available to your instructor after grades are turned in. This summary may enhance your instructor's teaching. It will also be used in the evaluation of your instructor for personnel matters such as retention, tenure and promotion. **If the question does not apply to your course, please select “not applicable/no opportunity to observe”**.

The instructor:

1. Demonstrated relevance of the course content.
   - 5. Strongly Agree
   - 4. Agree
   - 3. Neutral
   - 2. Disagree
   - 1. Strongly Disagree
   - Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

2. Used assignments that enhanced learning.
   - 5. Strongly Agree
   - 4. Agree
   - 3. Neutral
   - 2. Disagree
   - 1. Strongly Disagree
   - Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

3. Summarized/emphasized important points.
   - 5. Strongly Agree
   - 4. Agree
   - 3. Neutral
   - 2. Disagree
   - 1. Strongly Disagree
   - Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

4. Was responsive to questions and comments from students.
   - 5. Strongly Agree
   - 4. Agree
   - 3. Neutral
   - 2. Disagree
   - 1. Strongly Disagree
   - Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

5. Established an atmosphere that facilitated learning.
   - 5. Strongly Agree
   - 4. Agree
   - 3. Neutral
   - 2. Disagree
   - 1. Strongly Disagree
   - Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

6. Was approachable for assistance.
5. Strongly Agree
4. Agree
3. Neutral
2. Disagree
1. Strongly Disagree
Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

7. Was respectful of the diversity of students in this class.
5. Strongly Agree
4. Agree
3. Neutral
2. Disagree
1. Strongly Disagree
Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

8. Showed strong interest in teaching this class.
5. Strongly Agree
4. Agree
3. Neutral
2. Disagree
1. Strongly Disagree
Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

9. Used teaching methods that helped students learn important concepts.
5. Strongly Agree
4. Agree
3. Neutral
2. Disagree
1. Strongly Disagree
Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

10. Used grading criteria that were clear.
5. Strongly Agree
4. Agree
3. Neutral
2. Disagree
1. Strongly Disagree
Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

11. Helped students analyze complex/abstract ideas.
5. Strongly Agree
4. Agree
3. Neutral
2. Disagree
1. Strongly Disagree
Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

12. Provided meaningful feedback about student work.
5. Strongly Agree
4. Agree
3. Neutral
2. Disagree
1. Strongly Disagree
Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

13. Overall, this instructor's teaching was effective.
5. Strongly Agree
4. Agree
3. Neutral
2. Disagree
1. Strongly Disagree
Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

Free-Response Questions:

14. What do you think are the strengths of this instructor’s teaching?

15. What suggestions, if any, do you have to further improve the instructor’s teaching?

16. If you like, please use this space to elaborate on your responses.

Informational Items:

17. What is your current estimate of your expected overall grade in this course?
   A
   B
   C
   D or F
   Other (Credit/No Credit, Incomplete, etc.)

18. You are a:
   Freshman
   Sophomore
   Junior
   Senior
   Graduate Student
   Credential Only
   Other (e.g. Open University)

19. Did you complete this form without undue influence from other students?
   Yes
   No

20. Did you complete this form without undue influence from the instructor?
   Yes
   No
Instructions

This instrument is designed to be a professional evaluation of your instructor's teaching performance. It is NOT designed to measure your reaction to the subject, the facilities (such as the physical conditions of the classroom), or your instructor’s physical appearance. Your individual ratings will be anonymous and a summary of items 1-14 will be available to your instructor after grades are turned in. This summary may enhance your instructor's teaching. It will also be used in the evaluation of your instructor for personnel matters such as retention, tenure and promotion. If the question does not apply to your course, please select “not applicable/no opportunity to observe”.

The lab or activity instructor:

1. Made course requirements clear.
   - 5. Strongly Agree
   - 4. Agree
   - 3. Neutral
   - 2. Disagree
   - 1. Strongly Disagree
   - Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

2. Used grading criteria that were clear.
   - 5. Strongly Agree
   - 4. Agree
   - 3. Neutral
   - 2. Disagree
   - 1. Strongly Disagree
   - Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

3. Was well prepared for class or activity.
   - 5. Strongly Agree
   - 4. Agree
   - 3. Neutral
   - 2. Disagree
   - 1. Strongly Disagree
   - Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

4. Showed concern for student success in the course, and was accessible and responsive to students
   - 5. Strongly Agree
   - 4. Agree
   - 3. Neutral
   - 2. Disagree
   - 1. Strongly Disagree
   - Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

5. Made the class environment safe for students, including demonstration of the proper use of any equipment and techniques.
   - 5. Strongly Agree
   - 4. Agree
   - 3. Neutral
   - 2. Disagree
   - 1. Strongly Disagree
   - Not applicable/no opportunity to observe
6. Helped me integrate the lecture concepts with the class/activity.
   5. Strongly Agree
   4. Agree
   3. Neutral
   2. Disagree
   1. Strongly Disagree
   Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

7. Increased my understanding of the subject.
   5. Strongly Agree
   4. Agree
   3. Neutral
   2. Disagree
   1. Strongly Disagree
   Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

8. Stimulated my interest in the subject.
   5. Strongly Agree
   4. Agree
   3. Neutral
   2. Disagree
   1. Strongly Disagree
   Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

9. Overall, this instructor's teaching was effective.
   5. Strongly Agree
   4. Agree
   3. Neutral
   2. Disagree
   1. Strongly Disagree
   Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

Free-Response Questions:

10. What do you think are the strengths of this instructor's teaching?

11. What suggestions, if any, do you have to further improve the instructor’s teaching?

12. If you like, please use this space to elaborate on your responses.

Informational Items:

13. What is your current estimate of your expected overall grade in this course?
   A
   B
   C
   D or F
   Other (Credit/No Credit, Incomplete, etc.)

14. You are a:
   Freshman
   Sophomore
   Junior
   Senior
   Graduate Student
15. Did you complete this form without undue influence from other students?
   Yes
   No

16. Did you complete this form without undue influence from the instructor?
   Yes
   No
Policy Recommendation
Amendment A to S16-8
Selection and Review of Administrators

Legislative History: Modifies S16-8 to allow for the participation of lecturers and tenure track faculty on the search and review committees for academic Deans; college-wide election of all faculty representatives; and clarifies how selection and review committee chairs are determined. The current policy on the selection and review of administrators precludes lecturers and tenure track faculty from serving on selection and review committees for academic deans.

Whereas: The selection and review of academic deans is important to all faculty in a college, and

Whereas: Current policy provides seats on selection and review committees for only tenured faculty, and

Whereas: Tenure track faculty and lecturers may be interested in serving on search and/or review committees for their academic dean, and

Whereas: Diverse representation is important, therefore, be it

Resolved That S16-8 be modified as provided for in this policy recommendation.

Rationale: All faculty do have the opportunity to participate in the review and selection of academic deans through solicited input. However, providing the faculty in each college with the option to elect any faculty member who is interested in serving on a selection or review committee, permits each college to select from among all its faculty members the representatives they would like to have serve on a selection or review committee for academic Deans. Additional language was added to encourage at the beginning of the process outreach that results in a diverse search/review committee pool of candidates and to reinforce the importance of confidentiality throughout the search/review process.
Approved: 2/6/17
Vote: 5-1-3
Present: Grosvenor, Laker, Shifflett, Rajkovic, Ormsbee, Boekema,
Hart, Tran, Bailey
Absent: Higgins
Financial Impact: None expected
Workload Impact: No change from current situation.
Selection and Review of Administrators

1. Academic Administrator and Vice President Searches and Appointments

1.1 Applicability

This policy applies to searches for and reviews of Management Personnel Plan (MPP) administrators who serve university-wide as vice presidents and those within the Academic Division including the provost, deputy provost, deans and all other associate vice president or equivalent positions. Where not otherwise specified, the words ‘academic administrators’ as used in this policy means all those in the Academic Division.

1.2. Vacancies and Initiation of Procedures

As soon as practical after it is known that a vacancy has occurred or will occur in any of these positions, the President (for all vice presidents) or the Provost (for all other offices) shall cause a selection committee to be formed in accordance with these procedures.

1.3 Composition of Search Committees

Committees shall be large enough to allow for sufficiently broad representation, yet small enough so as not to be unwieldy. When feasible, an odd number of voting members will be appointed to eliminate the possibility of tied votes. Faculty, students, staff, and administrators shall be represented. Consideration should be given to representation of the diversity of the campus. Regular (tenured and tenure-track) faculty shall comprise a majority on all search committees for administrators in the academic affairs division and at least one-third of other committees. If appropriate, alumni and community representatives may serve on search committees.

1.3.1 Special Procedures for Deans of Academic Colleges: The search committees for college deans shall be composed of nine members: five tenured faculty (tenured, tenure track, lecturers), at least four of whom are tenured, who are not department chairs, and at least two who are chairs, all elected by and from the college faculty (no more than two from any department); two department chairs from the college, elected by its department chairs; one staff member, elected by the staff of the college; one student, one Dean (from outside the college searching for a Dean), and one member of the community or an SJSU administrator (MPP), each designated by the Provost. The faculty committee chair shall be appointed by the Provost.

1.3.1.1 Recruitment Procedures

Recruitment of the faculty and staff members shall be arranged and conducted by the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate through normal committee on committees processes. Interested faculty and staff will submit written statements reflecting their interest and qualifications.
Each chair is expected to encourage faculty and staff from their department to serve on the search committee so that the resulting ballots, as best as possible, reflect the diverse nature of the programs, students, and faculty in their college and the campus.

Following the close of nominations and before a ballot is constructed, the Provost will review the pool and consider the extent to which it is a representative group. The review can include, though is not limited to, representation of the programs in the college and the composition of the pool with regard to gender and ethnicity.

If the pool appears insufficiently representative, the Provost would consult with the Senate’s Executive Committee to determine how best to improve the representativeness of the search committee pool of candidates.

1.3.1.2 Election Procedures

The Senate office will forward the statements of each candidate to the college office so they can be distributed to faculty/staff.

1.3.1.2.1 Elections for the faculty representatives from the college shall be arranged and conducted by ad hoc election committee comprised of all department chairs not on the ballot in that college.

The ballot will be constructed by college staff to enable faculty to vote for five faculty including at least two chairs. Faculty receiving the most votes, taking into consideration tenure status, department, and the need for two chairs, shall be appointed to the committee by the Provost.

1.3.1.2.2 Election of the staff representative will be arranged and conducted by staff in the college office who are not on the ballot.

1.3.1.3 Appointment Procedures

The Provost appoints the community member or administrator, Dean, and a student.

Each department in the college shall nominate one student from its majors. The Provost shall designate, from among those nominated, one student as a committee member.

Those appointed should have experience or expertise relevant to one or more of the programs in the college and/or the position of Dean.

1.3.2 Special Procedures for the Dean of the University Library. The search committee shall be composed of nine members: three faculty librarians selected by and from the faculty librarians; one Library staff member, selected by the staff of the university library; one department chair from outside the library; one faculty member (not a chair) from outside the library; one student, one Dean (from outside the Library),
and one member of the community, each designated by the Provost. The faculty
commitee chair shall be appointed by the Provost.

1.3.3 Special Procedures for the Dean of International & Extended Studies (IES).
The search committee shall be composed of nine members: five faculty (inclusive of two
department chairs); two IES staff members, selected by the staff of IES; one Dean (from
outside IES), and one student, each designated by the Provost. The faculty committee
chair shall be appointed by the Provost.

Selected members should exhibit clear evidence of understanding IES and a history of
engagement with the programs and activities of IES.

1.4 Recruitment and Selection of Committee Members

1.4.1 Recruitment. Except as provided in 1.3.1, 1.3.2, and 1.3.3 above, an open
nomination process for potential members for search and review committees shall be
used. The Academic Senate shall publish notice of intention to appoint a search
committee and shall solicit written statements either in hard copy or electronically for
membership on the committee from the University community. Nominations (including
self-nominations) must include a statement of interest and qualifications and include the
nominee’s signed or electronic consent to serve by the published nomination deadline.

1.4.2 Selection. Except as provided in 1.3.1, 1.3.2, and 1.3.3 above, committee
members shall be selected, from among those nominated, by mutual consent of the
President and the Senate Executive Committee. If the President and the Executive
Committee cannot arrive at mutual agreement, the President (or Provost, if the search is
not for a vice president) shall confer with the chair of the Senate to attempt to arrive at a
mutually satisfactory course of action. Failing that, the President or Provost shall
appoint the membership. The President or Provost shall select the committee chair from
the committee membership.

1.5. Scope and Procedures

The President or Provost shall determine the scope and procedures of the search
process in consultation with the committee. The scope and procedures of the search,
the target date for the report, the minimum requirements for candidates, the
qualifications of the expected finalists, and other matters relating to the selection
process should be discussed. The scope of the search shall always be as wide as
feasible under the circumstances and shall be conducted in accordance with the
University's policies and procedures on equal opportunity and diversity. Likely
candidates must be interviewed. Provisions should be made for the campus community
to meet the candidates. The deliberations and recommendations of the committee shall
be confidential. Concerns regarding unethical conduct, inclusive of breaches of
confidentiality, should be reported to the Provost or President. Unethical conduct will
result in dismissal of the committee member by the Provost or President.

1.6. Committee Recommendations
At the conclusion of its search, the committee shall report to the President or Provost, without ranking, the names of the best-qualified candidates. The President or Provost shall meet with the committee to discuss its recommendations. The search committee's records shall be turned over to the President or Provost with its report. Upon delivery of the committee's report to the President or Provost all committee records shall be destroyed.

1.7. Action by the President

The President or Provost may appoint any person recommended by the committee. If the President or Provost decides not to appoint, or is unable to appoint, any of the recommended candidates, the President or Provost may ask the committee to extend the search, or the President or Provost may consult with the Senate Executive Committee regarding appointment of a new selection committee for a new search, consistent with the provisions of this policy.

1.8. Interim Appointments

An interim appointment occurs when a position covered by this policy has or will be vacated and there is insufficient time or it is otherwise impractical to complete the normal search process explained above. The President or Provost, in consultation with the elected members of the Senate Executive Committee, may make interim appointments. Alternatively, at the discretion of the President or Provost, the selection process for an interim appointee may utilize a selection committee wherein the interim position is announced campus-wide and interviews are held. While there is no requirement to announce the position off-campus, such announcement is not prohibited. The search committee must be no smaller than three people and will be selected by the President or Provost in consultation with the elected members of the Senate Executive Committee. Interim appointments usually are for a period of one year, unless a different period is specified at the time of the appointment. An interim appointment may be renewed or extended by the President or Provost as needed in consultation with the elected members of the Senate Executive Committee.

1.9. Acting Appointments

The title "acting" (e.g., acting dean) shall be applied to an individual who is designated to act on behalf of an administrator covered by this policy, who is on a short-term absence (illness, vacation, etc.), on leave, or has left his/her position on extremely short notice. The President or designee in consultation with the elected members of the Senate Executive Committee may make an acting appointment. In an emergency or when the Senate Executive Committee is not available, acting appointments may be made by the President or Provost in consultation with the Chair of the Academic Senate. Acting appointments usually are of short duration, lasting until either the incumbent returns or an interim appointment can be made according to the procedures described in this policy. In unusual circumstances, an acting appointment may be
renewed or extended by the President or Provost in consultation with the elected
members of the Senate Executive Committee.

2. Reviews of Administrators

2.1. Timing of Review

If the incumbent wishes to continue in his or her position beyond the sixth year, a review
of the incumbent shall be initiated according to the provisions of this policy in the
second semester of the fifth year of an incumbent's term. The review shall be concluded
by the beginning of the sixth year of the incumbent's term. The President may at any
time initiate an interim review.

2.2. Appointment and Composition of Review Committee

For all offices covered by this policy, a review committee shall be appointed and
constituted in accordance with the procedures specified in Part 1, Sections 1.3 and 1.4
of this policy. The Provost shall not be eligible to serve on committees to review
academic administrators.

2.3 Criteria for Review

The review committee, in consultation with the President (for vice presidents) or the
Provost (for all other offices), shall specify the criteria for evaluating the incumbent's job
performance, based upon the incumbent's job description and the function of the
particular administrative office. The incumbent shall be asked to examine the criteria
developed and to make such comments or suggestions as may seem advisable.

2.4 Procedures for Review

The review committee, in consultation with the President (for all Vice Presidents) or the
Provost (for all other offices), shall develop procedures for conducting the review. The
procedures shall be designed to secure (a) appropriate information, which can include
performance goals set by the appropriate administrator and (b) appraisals of
performance from as many persons as may be feasible who are knowledgeable of the
incumbent's duties and performance. In addition, available data for the time period of
the review should be analyzed as appropriate for the position (such as data on FTES,
FTEF, class size, graduation rates, and fundraising). If he/she so desires, the incumbent
shall be given an opportunity to provide the review committee with a self-evaluation
based upon the criteria developed by the committee. The opinions and judgments
received by review committees, the deliberations and reports of such committees, and
any accompanying materials, shall be confidential. Concerns regarding unethical
conduct, inclusive of breaches of confidentiality, should be reported to the Provost or
President. Unethical conduct will result in dismissal of the committee member by the
Provost or President.

2.5. Report of the Review Committee
2.5.1 The review committee shall consult with the President (for all vice presidents) or the Provost (for all other offices) before drafting its report. Following that consultation, and at the conclusion of its evaluative activities, the review committee shall prepare a written report embodying findings and conclusions. The report of the review committee shall include a statement of strengths found and improvements desired in the incumbent's performance with respect to the evaluative criteria. All raw data collected for review shall accompany, but not be part of, the review committee's report.

2.5.2 The report shall normally contain a specific recommendation by the review committee that the incumbent be reappointed or not be reappointed, with or without qualification. A majority vote of the review committee shall be sufficient to approve the report; the numerical vote shall be stated in the report. A minority report or reports shall be appended if requested by any member of the committee. Minority reports shall be seen by all members of a review committee.

2.5.3 Before forwarding the report, the review committee shall:

- provide a draft copy of the proposed report to the incumbent
- provide the incumbent with an opportunity to meet with the review committee in order to discuss the report
- provide the incumbent with the opportunity to submit to the committee a written statement which shall become part of the report to the President.

2.5.4 The President (for all vice presidents) or the Provost (for all other offices) shall again consult with the review committee to share his or her inclination and the reasons therefore.

2.6. Action of the President

Ultimate responsibility for the retention of administrators belongs solely to the President. If, after discussion with the review committee, the incumbent, and other appropriate sources of information, the President is inclined to believe a decision other than that recommended by the committee would best serve the interests of the University, before acting on that inclination the President shall consult with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, at which time both the report of the review committee and the reasons why the President is inclined to a decision other than that recommended would be revealed to and shared with the Executive Committee. The purpose of such a meeting would be to ascertain if some mutually agreeable course of action or decision can be found upon which the President could act. Failing that, the President shall make such decision as he or she considers best for the welfare of the University.
Policy Recommendation:

Amendment A to University Policy S16-14: Clarification of ‘Internship’

Legislative History: Amends S16-14

Rationale: Since the passage of this university policy in Spring 2016, the campus has received additional clarification from the Chancellor’s Office regarding which internships require University-Organization Agreements (UOA).

Resolved: That the following amendments be adopted immediately.

Whereas: CSU Executive Order 1064 “…recognizes the beneficial educational purpose of student internships, as well as the need to maximize the educational experience while mitigating the risks to participants and minimizing the university’s liability exposure;” and furthermore requires each campus “to develop, implement, maintain and publish a student internship policy…;” and

Whereas: Internship is defined as “…an off-campus activity designed to serve educational purposes by offering experience in a service learning, business, non-profit, or government setting” and as further defined by the Chancellor’s Office as excluding teacher preparation placements or clinical placements such as nursing, counseling, physical therapy or occupational therapy and including practicum courses where students work in settings off-campus; and

Whereas: SJSU provides significant opportunities for internships, service learning, and community engagement in many departments (the majority of SJSU departments offer either service learning or internships), some of which are credit bearing or are academic degree requirements and are therefore covered by Executive Order 1064; and
Whereas: CSU Executive Order 1064 requires a student internship policy governing internships where the university makes the placement (e.g., instructor provides the site(s) from which students must choose their internship, service learning, or off-campus experience); and

Whereas: An ad hoc committee with representation and input from three university divisions, Administration and Finance (Contracts and Purchasing; and Risk Management), Student Affairs (Career Center), and Academic Affairs (Center for Community Learning and Leadership and Graduate and Undergraduate Programs) worked for 4 years on the development of this policy and University-Organization Agreement (UOA), and a larger ad hoc committee (IFAC, Internship Faculty Advisory Committee) created in Fall 2014, including additional representation from the seven academic colleges, has given input on all aspects of this policy and the UOA; therefore be it

Resolved: That a University-Organization Agreement (UOA) template be created, consistent with the CSU system requirements, and overseen and maintained by the Office of Student and Faculty Success and designated offices (e.g., Center for Community Learning and Leadership; C CLL) and when changes are needed in the standard UOA template (not the modifications at the department/program level), these changes will be reviewed and approved by the University Curriculum & Research Committee; and be it further

Resolved: That a department and/or college will utilize the standard UOA template for Internships, Service Learning, and Off-Campus Learning Experiences where the university makes the placement, but can modify it, as needed, in consultation with and upon approval from Administration and Finance (e.g., Contracts and Purchasing, Risk Management) and notification to the Office of Student and Faculty Success; and be it further

Resolved: That if the internship is a degree requirement then students may make their own placement, but the department/program must provide at least one university-approved placement option requiring a UOA or an alternative experience as approved by department/program (e.g., course, independent study); be it further
Resolved: That if an internship is an elective for a degree program, it should be
clear (i.e., through catalog description, advising, and other program
materials) to the student that he/she will make their own placement and
no UOA will be required; be it further

Resolved: That when a student makes his or her own internship arrangements, the
student must sign a self-placement declaration on the Learning Plan
stating that the university did not make the placement and that the student
be made aware that the learning site is not covered in terms of liability, but
that the student is covered by CSU credit liability insurance (i.e.,
SAFECLIP), so long as the student is in good standing while completing
the internship and registered/enrolled in a course that requires internship
experience; be it further

Resolved: That for all internships, the student’s individual Learning Plan (LP) and
Participation Guidelines (PG) be created at the department level to
ensure that the non-SJSU learning site, the faculty member coordinating
and overseeing the internship and the students involved are in
agreement about the nature of the academic requirements and expected
outcomes; and be it further

Resolved: That the LP define the course expectations and learning outcomes
associated with the internship and that the outcomes of the LP relate to
the course learning outcomes or the program learning outcomes; and be
it further

Resolved: That the LP is provided to the employer or site supervisor providing the
internship; and be it further

Resolved: That full implementation of UOA, LP, and PG documents; and training
as necessary be developed and overseen by the Office of Student and
Faculty Success and designated offices (i.e., CCLL); and be it further

Resolved: That the campus, under the leadership of the Office of Student and
Faculty Success, investigate and implement solutions to streamline and
develop a simpler process for establishing agreements with partner sites
and develop procedures to address unique situations across
departments and students; and be it further

Resolved: That all learning sites be entered into the CSU database in a timely
fashion consistent with the development of this system-wide database, and the training of SJSU faculty and staff with its implementation with particular emphasis on risk management issues; and be it further

**Resolved:** That this policy be effective Fall 2016 and the UOA approval process formalized by Fall 2017.

**Approved (C&R):** February 6, 2017

**Vote:** 12-0-0

**Present:** Anagnos, Buzanski, Chang, Cargill, Chung, Grindstaff, Heil, Medrano, Mathur, Rodan, Trulio, Stacks

**Absent:** Matoush

**Curricular Impact:** This policy will bring SJSU into compliance with the governing CSU Executive Order. It will also establish procedures to document that credit-bearing internships, service learning courses, and off-campus learning experiences have established learning goals.

**Financial Impact:** Very closely tied to the Workload Impact. In addition, a new staff position in Office of Student and Faculty Success is required to fulfill the UOA processes.

**Workload Impact:** Workload will involve time spent orienting students to these requirements; time spent in coordination with SJSU offices and the students in handling/processing the required forms (LP, PG, UOA); and time spent maintaining updated information on the status of these forms and our partnering organizations.

Workload impact will be closely tied to the following factors:
- the number of students enrolled in a given department’s internship program
- the total number of organizations at which the department’s students are interning
- the percentage of the organizations with which a department is working already has a non-expired UOA on file
- the complexity of the UOA approval process.

Workload impact will also be tied to the agreed upon processes for handling UOAs within SJSU.
Policy Recommendation

Change in the Membership, Charge, and Category for the Student Success Committee

Legislative History: Rescinds S11-6 which pertains to the membership of the Student Success Committee.

Whereas: SJSU has taken proactive and definitive steps to strategically tackle issues related to student success through its Student Success Plan, and

Whereas: Reorganization of the student success committee in the context of the Plans’ initiatives and goals could facilitate progress campus wide, and

Whereas: The current structure and size of the student success committee may not be the most effective arrangement with regard to the coordination of efforts to improve student success or to effect changes to advance student success initiatives, therefore, be it

Resolved: That the current student success operating committee be dissolved and in its place constitute a special agency focused on student success that will report to the Instruction and Student Affairs Policy Committee, and be it further

Resolved: That the membership and charge of the newly constituted Student Success Committee be as proposed in this policy recommendation.

Rationale: SJSU needs a university-level committee focused on student success that is populated in a way that puts key representatives together who can help move initiatives forward, provide objective input on what’s working and what’s not, and can review and recommend changes to academic policies, practices, and procedures. With clear expectations about providing as well as receiving input, this group can be instrumental in offering advice and nurturing connections that enable all groups engaged in various aspects of student success to more effectively reach common goals. Constituting this group as a special agency with reporting responsibilities to the instruction and student affairs policy committee would work quite well and fits within the guidelines for special agencies as provided for in our bylaws: “Special agencies are bodies created by policies recommended by the Academic Senate which, because of functions or membership, are not designated Senate committees.”
Approved: 2/6/17
Vote: 9-0-0
Present: Grosvenor, Laker, Shifflett, Rajkovic, Ormsbee, Boekema, Hart, Tran, Bailey
Absent: Higgins
Financial Impact: None expected
Workload Impact: Increased workload for the originating members as they establish connections and determine how best to meet the elements of their charge and effectively impact efforts campus-wide around student success.

Charge:

In the context of the University's strategic plan, this committee reviews and recommends changes to academic policies, practices, and procedures as they relate to all aspects of student success. This would include, but is not limited to, student enrollment, financial aid, retention, engagement, academic skills and competencies, and time to degree. The committee will assist in identifying challenges, serve as a central information resource to gather recommendations and disseminate information on student success policies and goals and provide advice regarding the planning, development, and implementation of initiatives designed to facilitate student success.

Individual members are charged with the responsibility of maintaining robust communications with the groups they are affiliated with. This will be critically important to the group's ability to formulate sound recommendations that can shape and coordinate efforts to improve student success.

The group will report to the Instruction and Student Affairs Policy Committee. The Student Success Committee chair, at the conclusion of each academic year, will submit a report summarizing activities and accomplishments, as all special agencies do, to the Academic Senate.

Membership:

AVP Transition & Retention Services (Exo)  
AVP Faculty & Student Success (Exo)  
1 Reps from Academic Affairs - appointed by VP Ac. Affairs (Exo)  
1 Reps from Student Affairs - appointed by VP Student Affairs (Exo)  
1 Graduate/undergraduate student  
2 Undergraduate students  
5 faculty  

If any member cannot complete their term for any reason, or is absent from three regularly scheduled committee meetings, or repeatedly does not perform assigned committee duties, the committee chair may request a replacement from the Chair of the Committee on Committees.
Recruitment and Appointment of Members

Faculty members serve a 3-year term which is renewable for one additional 3-year term. When filling initial appointments, the Chair of the Committee on Committees will stagger the terms of non ex-officio seats. The student members serve a 1-year term and can be re-appointed. Solicitation of applications to serve on the Student Success Committee will be made through the normal Committee on Committees process for the seats designated for faculty members. Faculty interested in serving on this committee will submit a brief letter of interest that includes information regarding their experience and engagement in student success initiatives. When multiple applications are submitted for a seat, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate will select individuals to serve. In considering applicants, attention should focus on the person’s expertise in areas related to student success, direct engagement with student success initiatives, and the need for broad representation.

The student success committee will be co-chaired by the AVP for Faculty & Student Success and a faculty member selected by the committee members.
POLICY

RECOMMENDATION

Amendment C to S15-6,
Appointment of Regular
Faculty Employees;
Consideration for Early
Tenure for Previously
Tenured Faculty

Resolved: That S15-6 be amended as shown in the strikeout and underline of the following excerpt from the policy.

Rationale: From time to time, tenured faculty at other institutions elect to come to SJSU and many of them must give up their tenure at their prior institution to do so—starting over again as untenured faculty at SJSU. Under the terms of the CBA, SJSU can offer them a maximum of two years of “service credit,” thus lessening the length of time for tenure at SJSU from six years to four years. But four years is still a very long time to wait for a faculty member who has already been through a six year cycle elsewhere. In the past, some of these previously tenured faculty were encouraged to not only accept the two years of service credit, but to also apply for tenure a year or two “early.” This could lessen the time required to regain their previous status to a total of two or three years.

The new RTP policy (S15-8) made the requirements for early tenure more stringent. This reform was necessary for a variety of reasons and was duly considered and debated. However, the discussion about early tenure focused solely on our “native” faculty who begin their careers at SJSU. The implications of the more stringent standards for previously tenured faculty was never considered. Professional Standards is concerned that the new standards removes a tool that was previously available to help us recruit and retain some of our very best faculty.

Professional Standards has considered several ways of addressing this issue and has consulted with the Provost. The most acceptable strategy makes use of appointment letters. In this way, the individual situations of previously tenured faculty can be addressed on a case-by-case basis, with a judgment made at the time of hiring whether their previous record warrants special consideration for early tenure. This amendment changes the appointments policy to allow an appointment letter to make such a designation.

If this policy change were accepted, language in an appointment letter might read something like this if the University wished to encourage an early tenure application from a prospect. This particular example encourages an application for tenure after the fifth year:

At SJSU, probationary faculty may apply for early tenure under the terms explained in University Policy S15-8, which is attached. The policy specifies much higher standards for
early tenure than are required for tenure after a full six year period. However, in light of your prior tenure at a comparable university, SJSU offers to evaluate your application for tenure after five years of probation (with your service credit counting towards that time) using the normal standards for tenure. While a favorable decision will still depend upon your ability to meet our standards, this offer will give you an option that you may find helpful if you seek to reduce your time to tenure.

We believe that the CBA permits this policy change. The CBA reads as follows:

13.3 The normal period of probation shall be a total of six (6) years of full-time probationary service and credited service, if any. Any deviation from the normal six (6) year probationary period shall be the decision of the President following his/her consideration of recommendations from the department or equivalent unit and appropriate administrator(s).

The President, through the Provost, would control whether the opportunity was extended in the appointment letter, and the President, through the Provost, would also continue to decide whether the early tenure would be granted at the time of the performance review, thus doubly complying with CBA 13.3.

Approved: Under Review by the Committee

Vote: 8-0-0

Present: Peter, Green, Lee, Reade, Caesar, Hamedi-Hagh, Marachi, Hwang

Absent: White, Kauppila

Financial Impact: There is a possibility that a small number of faculty may be promoted a year or two earlier than they otherwise would be, leading to higher salary costs. There is also a possibility that this will help us to recruit and retain promising faculty, leading to fewer failed searches and lower attrition, which would have cost savings.

Workload Impact: No direct impacts.
POLICY RECOMMENDATION
Amendment C to S15-6
Appointment of Regular Faculty Employees;
Consideration for Early Tenure for Previously Tenured Faculty

5.0 Appointment letters

5.1 Appointment letters shall be written by the college dean in consultation with the chair of the department.

5.2 Appointment letters must be approved by the Office of the Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs, who shall also provide suitable templates to the Colleges.

5.3 The letter shall reference the relevant university policies and department guideline regarding the criteria and standards for retention, tenure, and promotion.

5.4 Appointment letters may summarize and clarify how the expectations contained in policy and guidelines will apply to a faculty member, but the letter may not change or contradict the standards. If there is a perceived conflict between an appointment letter and university policies, the policy language shall take precedence.

5.5 In the case of a previously tenured faculty member, an appointment letter may specify whether the faculty member might be reviewed for tenure and promotion using the normal standards of the Criteria policy (S15-8, 4.1.3) earlier than the 6th probationary year.

5.6 Any subsequent change in the particular character of a faculty member’s academic assignment shall be made in writing and approved by the faculty member, the department chair, the college dean, and the AVP for Faculty Affairs. An addendum to the appointment letter must then be included in the personnel action file and in subsequent dossiers. Faculty who believe their academic assignment has significantly changed may request a review of their appointment letter by submitting a written request to their Chair. It is their responsibility to submit any such requests according to published timelines.
Policy Recommendation

Final Examinations, Evaluations, or Culminating Activities Policy

Legislative history: Replaces S06-4

Whereas: University policy S06-4 requires that all classes have a final examination or other appropriate culminating activity at the scheduled final examination time; and

Whereas: There is concern that some faculty have taken it upon themselves to reschedule exams to times that are not allowed by current policy, including during the regular semester or “Study/Conference Day,” to the disadvantage of students; and

Whereas: The choice of appropriate culminating experience is a curricular matter that rightly belongs to the faculty; therefore be it

Resolved: that the policy statement below be adopted as university policy on final examinations, evaluations, or culminating activities.

Final Examinations, Evaluations, or Culminating Activities Policy

Faculty members are required to have a culminating activity for their courses, which can include a final examination, a final research paper or project, a final creative work or performance, a final portfolio of work, or other appropriate assignment.

Time Frame for Culminating Activities:

In the case where there is to be a timed, sit down final examination or an online synchronous final, it must occur during the scheduled final examination time for that course. The required submission date and time for take-home examinations, final papers or other culminating activities
must fall no earlier than the first day of the final examination period. Online asynchronous final exams are to be treated like take-home exams. Final exams shall not be given, nor culminating activities due, during regularly scheduled class periods or on “Study/Conference Day.” Supervision and individual study courses (180, 184, 297, 298, 299) are not required to have a culminating activity.

Exceptions to Time Frame for Culminating Activities:

Exceptions for the above time frame are justified in the following circumstances:

a. Performance courses in which it is impractical to examine each student individually in the time period assigned for final examinations; e.g. performance courses in theater arts, music, or athletics.

Circumstances in which students may request the rescheduling of a culminating activity:

a. A student may request the rescheduling of a culminating activity if there is a verifiable emergency.

b. A student may request the rescheduling of a culminating activity if three or more are scheduled/due within a 24-hour period. Requests must be made at least three weeks prior to the last class meeting of the semester.

   i. If one of the three or more culminating activities scheduled for the same day is a paper or project, the deadline for the paper/project will be moved to a mutually agreeable time within the final examination period.

   ii. If three or more finals are scheduled on the same day, the student may request an alternative exam date and/or time from any one of the instructors.

   iii. If an alternate time for a regularly scheduled final exam period cannot be arranged between the student and the instructor, the rescheduled exam will be taken during the final exam-makeup period.

c. In the case of either a verifiable emergency or the student having more than two culminating activities scheduled within a 24-hour period: if a student and instructor are unable to reach agreement on rescheduling, the chair will first be consulted. If no agreement can be found through the chair, the dean (or designee) will be consulted.
Oversight of Culminating Activities

a. The department chairperson will oversee culminating activities (examinations; portfolios; research or creative projects) in a manner that assures that the rules for culminating activities are followed. If a dispute arises, the dean (or designee) will be consulted.

Approved: November 14, 2016

Vote: 16-0-0

Present: Campsey, Kaufman, Khan, Medina, Medrano, Miller, Nash, Ng (non-voting), Perea, Sen, Simpson, Spica, Sullivan-Green, Trousdale, Walters, Wilson, Whyte

Financial Impact: None

Workload Impact: Small workload addition for chairs to educate and consult with faculty members about appropriate culminating experiences.
Policy Recommendation
Rescinds S82-10 and F86-7 Pertaining to Technology-Related Advisory Boards

Legislative History: Rescinds S82-10 (established the information systems and computing advisory board) and F86-7 (added a member to the information systems and computing advisory board).

Whereas: The Information Systems and Computing Advisory Board was dissolved in 1998 (S98-9) and replaced with a CIO Advisory Board, and
Whereas: The CIO Advisory Board was dissolved in 2000 (S00-5), and
Whereas: At that time, earlier policies pertaining to the Information Systems and Computing Advisory Board were overlooked, therefore, be it

Resolved: That S82-10 and F86-7 be rescinded.

Rationale: This corrects an oversight and rescinds policies related to committees which no longer exists.

Approved: 2/6/17
Vote: 7-0-1
Present: Laker, Shifflett, Boekema, Rajkovic, Hart, Grosvenor, Ormsbee, Tran
Absent: Bailey, Higgins
Financial Impact: None
Workload Impact: None