I. Call to Order and Roll Call –

II. Approval of Minutes –
   Senate Minutes of April 4, 2016

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

IV. Executive Committee Report
   A. Minutes of the Executive Committee –
      Exec. Minutes of March 21, 2016
      Exec. Minutes of April 11, 2016
   B. Consent Calendar –
   C. Executive Committee Action Items –
      AS 1613, Senate Management Resolution, Conferring the Title of Honorary Senator on Dr. Judith Lessow-Hurley (Final Reading)
      AS 1615, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Support of the You Can Play Project (Final Reading)

V. Unfinished Business –

VI. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation):
   A. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
      AS 1583, Policy Recommendation: Internships, Service Learning, and Off-Campus Learning Experiences (Final Reading)
      AS 1607, Policy Recommendation: Restoring Options for Students with Quantitative Reasoning Disabilities Affecting Math Skills (Final Reading)
      AS 1609, Policy Recommendation: Amendment to F13-2, Technology Intensive, Hybrid, and Online Courses and Programs (Final Reading)
B. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
   AS 1608, Policy Recommendation, Student Rights and Responsibilities (Final Reading)

   AS 1620, Policy Recommendation, Probation and Disqualification (First Reading)

C. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
   AS 1611, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds S02-8 (Information Technology Resources Responsible Use Policy) (Final Reading)

   AS 1616, Policy Recommendation, Amending S15-6, To Clarify Procedures for Recruitment Committees (First Reading)

   AS 1618, Policy Recommendation, Amending S15-7, To Clarify Secret Ballots for Choosing RTP Committees (First Reading)

   AS 1619, Policy Recommendation, Adopting New SOTE and SOLATE Instruments (First Reading)

   AS 1617, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Calling for Widespread Consultation Prior to Finalizing any Standards and/or Implementation Strategies Pertaining to Electronic Communications (Final Reading)

D. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
   AS 1605, Policy Recommendation, Electronic Voting (Final Reading)

   AS 1603, Policy Recommendation, Committee Obligations and Senate Membership—Modification of bylaw 6 (Final Reading)

   AS 1590, Policy Recommendation, Remote Attendance at Senate and Committee Meetings (Final Reading)

   AS 1621, Policy Recommendation, Departmental Voting Rights (First Reading)

E. University Library Board (ULB):

VII. Special Committee Reports:
    Faculty Diversity Report by AVP for Faculty Affairs, Elna Green, Time Certain: 2:15 p.m.
VIII. **New Business:**

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

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

Ex Officio:
Present: Kimbarow, Amante, Van Selst, Lee
Absent: Heiden, Sabalius

CASA Representatives:
Present: Lee, Shifflett, Sen, Grosvenor
Absent: Schultz-Krohn

Administrative Representatives:
Present: Larouche, Martin
Absent: Lanning, Blaylock, Feinstein

COB Representatives:
Present: Virick, Sibley, Campsey

Deans:
Present: Green, Jacobs, Stacks
Absent: Hsu

EDUC Representatives:
Present: Mathur, Laker

Students:
Present: Abukhdeir, Medrano, Sarris, Sandoval-Rios
Absent: Gay, Romero

ENGR Representatives:
Absent: Hamedi-Hagh, Sullivan-Green, Backer

Alumni Representative:
Present: Walters

H&A Representatives:
Present: Frazier, Bacich, Khan, Grindstaff
Absent: Riley

Emeritus Representative:
Present: Buzanski

SCI Representatives:
Present: Kaufman, Beyersdorf, Clements
Absent: White

General Unit Representatives:
Present: Matoush, Kauppiila
Absent: Medina

SOS Representatives:
Present: Peter, Curry, Wilson
Absent: Coopman

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–
The minutes of March 7, 2016 were approved as written (34-0-2).

III. Communications and Questions –
A. From the Chair of the Senate:
Chair Kimbarow announced the results of the Spring 2016 Senate elections and that there were a number of Senate seats left vacant. The Executive Committee, in consultation with the Senators from the colleges with vacancies, will now appoint faculty to those seats for one-year terms.

On Monday, April 11, 2016, from 10 a.m. to Noon, there will be the first of a series of campus climate conversations in the Student Union Theatre. There will be breakout sessions of small groups to facilitate conversations about campus climate. One additional session is planned this spring and then more in the fall.
CommUniverCity's 11th anniversary gathering, Celebrating Partnerships, is April 27, 2016 from 4:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. at the Roosevelt Community Center in San Jose located at 901 E. Santa Clara Street. Executive Director, Dayana Salazar, and Katherine Kao Cushing, Associate Director of CommUniverCity, would like to extend a personal invitation to members of the SJSU Academic Senate to attend.

President Martin has invited all Senators to attend an end of the semester celebration at her home on Sunday, May 1, 2016, from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m.

There are eight days left for a settlement to be reached between the CFA and the Chancellor before the faculty strike. We are all hoping that this is resolved but if it is not, Senators were encouraged to remember that the dispute is not between the faculty and the administrators on campus. Senators were encouraged to maintain a kind and supportive community in the face of what could be a difficult and challenging situation.

B. From the President of the University –
Interim President Martin is working closely with incoming President Papazian. President Papazian will make the final selection of the Chief Diversity Officer and the Vice President for Administration and Finance.

Interim President Martin announced that if a strike does occur, services will still be available for students.

IV. State of the University Announcements. Questions. In rotation.

A. Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF) –
SJSU will be breaking ground at the end of this semester on the new Student Recreation and Aquatic Center. This project is being funded out of student fees that were approved by the students in 2007 as part of the Student Union and Facilities fee. The first project was the Student Union expansion and renovation and the next project is the Student Recreation and Aquatic Center. The Student Recreation and Aquatic Center will be located next to the Event Center where Royce and Hoover Hall are currently located. Royce and Hoover Hall will both be demolished and only Washburn Hall will remain. The new Student Recreation and Aquatic Center will be about 124,000 square feet and it is two stories. The first floor will have a climbing area and multi-activity use court as well as cardio equipment, locker rooms, and rest rooms. The second floor will have an indoor track, then there is more space for cardio equipment as well as rooms for fitness classes. There will be lots of windows and gathering places. There will be pools and BBQ space as well. Construction will start this summer and the Aquatic Center will be closed at the end of this semester. The project should be completed in early 2019.

Questions:

Q: What is going to happen to our competitive swimmers, are we replacing the
housing that is being knocked down in some way, and are we using the same contractor we used for the Student Union?

A: No, we will not be using the same contractor. There will be a significant impact on our water sports athletes. Their conferences and practices will be held offsite. It will be painful for those student athletes. As for housing, Campus Village 2 will be ready for fall and will hold 800 students, so when we knock down Royce and Hoover Halls, we will still have a net increase in housing for 400 students.

Q: What is going to happen to the space in our current Event Center that is now used as a weight room and some multipurpose rooms?

A: That is still being evaluated, but we are looking at using it as dedicated space for our sports club teams such as Rugby, Hockey, and Judo.

Q: Currently we have a recreation pool that is also used for competition. Does having both a recreation and competition pool mean that the competition pool will be used only for competition?

A: Interim VP Larochelle commented that she could not answer what the programming plans were for the pools right now, but the intention is that there is a recreation pool and a competition pool that does allow for swimming as well. The pools will still be managed by the Student Union, and faculty and staff will have the opportunity to buy a use permit. That will still be available.

Q: What about energy consumption, will the pools be solar powered?

A: From a sustainability perspective, we are still discussing at what level of being certified we are going to be. We are shooting for the “gold” certified. It will have dual plumbing from a recycled water perspective. We haven’t discussed solar power. What we do have from a solar perspective is the 7th Street garage.

Q: Will the old recreation center be completely closed, or just closed for the summer?

A: The Recreation Center will be open throughout, but the Aquatic Center will be closed in order to begin the site preparation.

Q: When will the Student Union be fully opened?

A: They are all moved in!

Q: You can’t walk through right now.

A: The bookstore hasn’t moved in yet, but the fact that you can’t walk though it is news to me.

The official celebratory opening will be in the fall semester.

B. Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA) – Not Present

C. Associated Students President –

AS will start elections next week for the AS Board members, and the new AS Board will take over on June 1, 2016.
AS is working on “Celebrating Diversity Day.” This is a day of celebration of the different cultures, etc.

AS will also be involved with the Campus Climate discussions this coming week.

AS has been lobbying to get more money for the CSU and faculty.

AS is working on a renter’s rights campaign with the city of San José.

AS is celebrating Sexual Assault Awareness month.

AS is hosting the CSSA meeting on campus and this is the first meeting held at SJSU in ten years.

AS President Amante is graduating this semester. The Senate thanked President Amante for her service this year and congratulated her.

D. Vice President for University Advancement (VPUA) – No report.

E. CSU Statewide Senators –
Senator Lee reported that the CSU Academic Senate will meet the week of May 20, 2016. Senator Van Selst reported that a lot of attention has been given to the quantitative reasoning taskforce recommendation to add another year of quantitative coursework in high school and there is some political interest in that as well.

Senator Van Selst reported that at the CSU Statewide Senate, there was a recommendation that a Math course be required in the fourth year of high school. There is also is a taskforce on quantitative reasoning looking at what the admissions and graduation standards around quantitative reasoning should be.

Questions:

Q: If this were to happen, when would the extra Math class be required?
A: I imagine that is multiple years away.

Q: Is that currently a requirement for UC?
A: No.

Q: So no one in California is required to take an extra Math class?
A: Not in California. However, there is also pressure for a “Principles in Programming” class in the High School Curriculum, so this class might fit there.

Q: What if you are at a high school that doesn’t offer the highest levels of Math and the student finishes all Math as a junior?
A: They are looking at different options. There is a lot of interest in addressing the unpreparedness of our incoming students.
F. Provost – No report.

V. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –
   Executive Committee Minutes of February 29, 2016 – No questions.
   Executive Committee Minutes of March 14, 2016 –
   Senator Buzanski inquired as to whether the proposal regarding the renumbering of university policies had been implemented as talked about in item #4. Chair Kimbarow replied that the Executive Committee had approved the proposal and the Senate Administrator is in the process of implementing the changes.

B. Consent Calendar – The Senate approved the consent calendar of April 4, 2016 as written.

The Senate Spring 2016 Election results were provided in the Senate packet.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:
   Senator Peter made a motion to suspend the rules to present a Sense of the Senate Resolution from the floor. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the motion was approved by a two-thirds vote (35-0-0).

   Senator Peter presented a *Sense of the Senate Resolution from the floor of the Senate, Calling for the CSU and CFA to Implement the Recommendations of the Neutral Fact-Finder’s Report and Avert a Strike (Final Reading)*. The Senate voted and the resolution was approved (32-0-3).

VI. Unfinished Business - None

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

A. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) –
   Senator Kaufman presented *AS 1602, Policy Recommendation, Course Syllabi (Final Reading)*.

   Debate:

   Senator James Lee presented an amendment to line 143 to add “reading assignment” between the two commas. The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Lee amendment failed (0-35-0).

   Senator Kaufman presented an amendment to add, “items such as” after “including” on line 143. The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Kaufman amendment failed (0-35-0).
Senator Kaufman presented an amendment to add, “, and any other relevant information” after, “exam date and time” on line 144. The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Kaufman amendment passed (24-4-2).

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to remove the double comma on line 143.

Senator Bacich presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to line 206 to change “off” to “of” before syllabi.

The Senate voted and AS 1602 passed as amended (34-0-0).

Senator Kaufman presented AS 1608, Policy Recommendation, Student Rights and Responsibilities (First Reading).

There is a Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy that has been on the University books since 1990. As you can imagine, many federal and state regulations have changed over the past 26 years. This is an attempt to do something similar to what we did with the syllabi policy. Take all the relevant language and pertinent information scattered across different places on campus and combine it on one website where students can find it all, and the I&SA Committee would review and make updates to every year. The idea is to have a link to this website with further links to important information from all important websites, e.g. the VPSA website.

Questions:

Q: I’m really confused about what you mean on lines 48 and 49 where you say “students also have the right to challenge, within legal means, the scholarship of others on scholarly grounds.”
A: I think the idea is that honest debate in classrooms and within the university allows for scholarly work to be challenged by other scholarly work.
Q: What does “within legal means” mean?
A: I will take this back to the committee and get clarification on it.

Q: What was the reasoning for the Nay vote?
A: It was an abstention not a “Nay” vote. I believe it was someone that came in mid-discussion.

Q: When you bring this back for a final reading, could you drop “greensheets?”
A: Yes, thanks for pointing that out.

Q: Why are student organizations part of this list?
A: There is CSU policy that covers what it means to be an official student organization and with that comes certain rights and responsibilities.
Q: Do students understand some of the terms on this list? For example, do they know what Academic Freedom means, or do they have to scroll down the list and click on the items to find out?
A: That’s a good point.

Q: Has the committee discussed having one or two lines after each bullet point describing what can be found there?
A: This is a good suggestion.

Q: Is it the intention that the list be part of the policy?
A: No, I apologize. When I sent this to Eva I wanted these two lists to be examples, but they are not part of the policy.

B. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –
Senator Peter presented AS 1611, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds S02-8, Information Technology Resources Responsible Use Policy (First Reading)

In 2002, SJSU got a new Chief Information Officer who wanted to implement a Responsible Use Policy. He wrote the current policy and brought it to the Executive Committee and asked us to bring it to the Senate and we did. However, the Senate had no role in writing the details of that policy.

In 2013, the CSU came out with its own Responsible Use Policy for all campuses. That policy largely duplicates our policy. We have been asked to rescind our policy. The PS Committee has reviewed both policies and see no reason to keep ours in place. Therefore, we are planning to abolish the campus Responsible Use Policy.

Questions:

Q: Is there a reason not to waive the first reading?
A: We thought about that, but felt we should give the campus time to review it and see if anyone has any objections.

Q: There is a campus policy that talks about email communication, is that involved here?
A: No, that is another policy and we will be addressing that later today.

Senator Peter presented AS 1610, Policy Recommendation, Electronic Information and Communication (First Reading).

This policy is being presented to replace our 1997 policy. That policy came online when we began to become concerned that more and more faculty were using email and would like to maintain a certain level of privacy when they did so. However, it was clear that the university email could never be completely private. Even at that time
there were freedom of information act requests that could by law open a person’s email to examination, and then there were other possibilities. The key element of the old policy was that all electronic mail in authorized email accounts would be considered private and confidential, except as required by state or federal law. Over the years concerns have been voiced. Most recently there have been some requested changes that were sent to the Organization and Government Committee and then on to the Professional Standards Committee. We discovered many other issues and we believe that if this comes back to you as a second reading, it will come back in a different form. Nevertheless, we wanted to get the discussion going, so we brought this version for a first reading.

Questions:

Q: When I look at line 72 on the third parties, and given that we use Gmail, clearly they are watching who I send emails to because it fills in the line for me when I start typing. This would suggest Gmail is watching what I do and that would be a third party.
A: There are lots of issues around privacy.

Q: Has the PS Committee seen our agreement with Google?
A: No. We haven’t asked to see it yet. One concern is that because of FERPA laws, the official email account needs to have certain characteristics that can only be guaranteed with a contract. This is a separate issue.

Q: We don’t know if the terms of our current contract meet this requirement do we?
A: Yes, that was the whole purpose of going to a contract with them.

C. Organization and Government Committee (O&G) –
Senator Shifflett presented AS 1594, Policy Recommendation, Update of Policy on Selection and Review of Administrators (Final Reading).
Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to delete “two” on line 110 before “department chairs,” and to make “department chairs” read “department chair.”
The Senate voted and AS 1594 passed as amended (32-0-0).

Senator Shifflett presented AS 1612, Policy Recommendation, Special Agencies (Modification of bylaw 10) (Final Reading).

Debate:

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to add on line 32, “d) Budget Advisory Committee” after “c) Athletics Board” on line 31, and then re-letter the rest of the items. Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to insert after line 20, a new whereas to read, “Whereas: A new Special Agency (Budget Advisory Committee) was created fall 2015, and.”
The Senate voted and AS 1612 was approved as amended (28-0-0).
Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1603, Policy Recommendation, Committee Obligations and Senate Membership (Modification of Bylaw 6) (Final Reading).*

**Debate:**

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to add the word “other” before “special, or special agency” in lines 189 and 198.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change line 155 to read, “members of the Senate policy committees.”

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to change line 156 to add, “unofficial” before “designee or representative.” The amendment was seconded. Senator Shifflett withdrew her amendment.

Senator Frazier made a motion to return to committee for clarification as to how certain committees where the members are elected by the colleges, such as the Board of General Studies and the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility, will be handled. The motion was seconded. **The Senate voted and the Frazier motion passed.**

E. **University Library Board (ULB) –** No Report.

E. **Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) –**

   Senator Mathur presented *AS 1607, Policy Recommendation, Restoring Options for Students with Quantitative Reasoning Disabilities Affecting Math Skills (First Reading).*

At SJSU we have historically had processes in place for substitution of our general education Math requirement. The general education Math requirement has changed over time. This policy recommendation provides a pathway for providing students with quantitative reasoning disabilities with reasonable accommodations. For these students, this would be a collaborative effort. Students would be involved, departments would be involved, as well as Graduate and Undergraduate Studies.

**Questions:**

Q: Can we interpret that to mean there can be situations when an accommodation is not made?
A: The Senate Chair recognized Cindy Marota, Director, Accessible Education Center (AEC). Director Marota responded that this was correct. Not every student that is requesting a math substitution will be allowed that substitution. We are not asking for a waiver, just a course substitution where math is not an essential requirement. We cannot and would never waive, or substitute out, an essential element of a major. It is only for
those majors where math is not an essential function.

Q: Why a Senate policy? Aren’t we obligated under law to accommodate students with disabilities?
A: Yes, this is a law. The AEC has been trying for a very long time to get a formal policy in place so it is recognized and the student can go through the process seamlessly.

Q: But, there are a number of other disabilities that are taken care of without a Senate policy, so why do we need one for this?
A: The AEC was told that it needed to take this route. Chair Mathur responded that, “With this particular disability, there has been some disagreement with some of the administrators as to whether there should be a substitution or not. Prior to 2008 there was a process in place. That process was modified in 2008 and eliminated completely in 2010. This is why we are moving forward with this policy.

Q: Can you summarize what was said and why there is disagreement with the law?
A: Some people feel that the B4 requirement is a core competency and we should not make any substitution for any student.

Q: There are many programs that will not do a waiver, will there be a list of the majors that will accept the waiver?
A: Just to clarify, we are not asking for a waiver. We are asking for a substitution. I’m assuming that departments will go back to their old process of what was effective for persons with this disability and maintain a list. However, they will always consult with the degree program when requesting a substitution.

Q: What about the other types of disabilities or learning differences, should we have a policy about a specific type of disability or a policy that covers all of them?
A: This math substitution has always been such a hot topic, because some people don’t believe it is a real disability. The law clearly states that you cannot have a student’s GPA affected by taking these courses over and over again. It also becomes a financial burden as well. With no procedure in place at SJSU, we are at high risk. The thought was to come to the Senate and see how we could work this.

Q: Thank you Cindy for coming today. You and I have had many conversations about this in the past. As I understand it, the difference at the high school level is that students can achieve according to the best of their abilities, but at the college level the student has to meet the standard regardless of what their disability is. Can you tell me how the substitution is designed to ensure they meet that standard?
A: In the secondary education system, the laws are different. In the secondary education system, a student with a disability must have accommodations in place or services to assist them to graduate. When the student comes to a four-year university, the standard changes to “otherwise qualified.” This means they must meet the application standards for the university. Once they are in, they are held to the “otherwise qualified” standard with accommodations. They are not guaranteed success. It is leveling the playing field. This policy would say the university is recognizing a disability that is real and is recognized for
a student diagnosed with this that is in a major that does not require math as an essential function. These students will be treated equally in their major with accommodations to attempt all those classes.

Q: What is it that guarantees departments the right to reject the waiver?  
A: This is a reminder that this is not a waiver. When it says collaborative efforts of the SJSU program, it does not mean they have to agree. If the department feels it is an essential part of the degree, they can advise the student to choose another pathway for a degree program.

Q: I would encourage you in the second reading to make that more explicit.

Senator Mathur presented **AS 1609, Policy Recommendation, Amendment to F13-2, Technology Intensive, Hybrid and Online Courses and Programs (First Reading).**

In 2002 the CSU put out Executive Order 1098 to eliminate the SSETF. Executive Order 1098 specified that no additional miscellaneous course fees, except for field trips, were authorized. In 2013, we passed our Technology Intensive, Hybrid and Online Courses and Programs Policy. There is an extra fee exemplar in that policy that allows for charging students for proctoring. This is not allowed now according to Executive Order 1098. This amendment is to remove that exemplar and substitute it with the statement in the resolved clause as follows: “Any course that requires students to pay extra fees for field trips (only allowable course fee according to CSU Executive Order 1078) must indicate so on the syllabus.”

**Questions:**

Q: I’m not understanding the connection between field trips and proctoring?  
A: In the Executive Order it eliminates the option for courses to charge extra fees with the exception of field trips.  
Q: So are we saying they are going to take a field trip to the proctoring office?  
A: No, we are just listing it because it is the only permissible fee.

Q: This policy is being brought to us entirely to deal with the proctoring?  
A: That is correct.

A: Part of the process of getting the SSETF in place was to change the rules pertaining to the miscellaneous course fees. Then separate from that were the field trips that are still allowed. This is a situation that only applies to SJSU. All other miscellaneous fees are wiped out besides the SSETF, except for field trip fees.

A: Currently, in the policy, it says that any course that requires students to pay extra fees such as for proctoring, must indicate so on the syllabus. What we are doing with this amendment is trying to clean up that language and replace it with field trips which are the only allowable expense.
VIII. Special Committee Reports –

**Campus Climate Survey Report** by Senator Meg Virick, Interim Director of the School of Management, and Scott Heil, Director, Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics (IEA)

The Campus Climate Survey was completed in Spring of last year. This was not the first time that a Campus Climate Survey had been done on campus. Previous Campus Climate Surveys were completed in 2005, 2006, and 2010.

The President’s Commission on Diversity (PCD) took over handling the Campus Climate Survey. The PCD developed the questions on the survey. The goal was to develop a survey that they could use for comparison over time. Four different versions of the survey went out to students, faculty, staff, and administrators. The types of questions were a little different for each group. The analysis involved both quantitative and qualitative data.

There was a response rate of approximately 20%. The student response was slightly more female. It was about 5% higher than the rest of the population. The age of the population was pretty similar across surveys. The ethnicity followed the university demographic pretty closely.

Most of the survey respondents had a favorable or positive response. One example is the answer to the question about whether the respondent viewed the campus as being respectful or not, and 71% of students as well as 67% of employees believe that the campus is either very respectful or moderately respectful.

When it comes to negative attributes such as whether the campus is racist or sexist, a small minority says the campus is completely free of racism and sexism. However, in general we are broadly viewed as being on the favorable side.

Women did report higher incidents of sexism than men, and black students did report more experiences of the campus racism than other students.

There were some differences between faculty and staff. In general, faculty were more critical of the university on a range of attributes. Administrators were the second most critical of the university, with staff being the least critical.

A significant part of the survey dealt with discrimination and harassment, including the kind of discrimination and who was the perpetrator of the offense. The most common type of discrimination was student-to-student. Overall 52% of student respondent’s reported some type of discrimination or harassment. The most common kind of discrimination and harassment was race, gender, and political views. African-American students faced more race-based harassment and women faced more gender discrimination.

In the 2010 Campus Climate Survey, there was a question that asked whether the students believed the staff of the university were sensitive to issues of discrimination around sexism, racism, and homophobia and the team measured a decline in sensitivity by staff.
Faculty, staff, and administrators all reported incidents of discrimination with the most common type being in group, e.g. faculty-to-faculty and administrator-to-administrator. The most common type of discrimination for faculty was gender. For administrators, the most common discrimination was gender and age. Lastly, for staff the most common type of discrimination was race and age.

Another common theme that emerged is that there were quite a few problems around open communication or the idea of voicing an unpopular opinion. There is a lot of concern that the environment is not conducive to open communication and there are not a lot of opportunities to voice your opinion, and sometimes there is direct hostility to having these type of conversations.

One frequent comment from students is that they would like to have more events on campus, but this was also expressed by faculty and staff as a need to build more campus community and to have deeper engagement outside of the classroom.

One large difference between the 2010 survey and this survey was huge increase in the number of students that reported safety problems on campus. Students feel a lot less safe.

Faculty morale also had a big decrease from the 2010 survey results. Faculty expressed a lot of concern about decision-making, shared governance, and the sharing of information on campus. Staff also reported a pronounced trend looking for greater recognition and opportunities for career advancement. All employee versions of the survey showed concern over the administration since 2010.

There is additional data on the IEA website and an interactive tool to allow you to pull the data off in different ways.

IX. New Business – None

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 4:48 p.m.
Executive Committee Meeting Minutes  
ADM 167, Noon to 1:30 p.m.  
March 21, 2016

Present: Kimbarow, Peter, Frazier, Shifflett, Kaufman, Lee, Mathur, Heiden, Martin, Feinstein, Blaylock, Larochelle, Lanning

Absent: Backer, Amante

1. The Executive Committee minutes of March 14, 2016 were approved as amended by Senator Shifflett (13-0-0).

2. Updates:
   a. **From the President** –
      The *Inspiration to Innovation* gala on March 19, 2016 in the SU Ballroom was a wonderful event, and Mrs. Lupe Diaz Compean was very pleased.

      Interim President Martin is in contact with President Papazian and is keeping her informed and involved with all major decisions such as the signing of policies the Senate passes, e.g. the Strategic Planning Policy.

      The Chief Diversity Officer and Vice President of Administration and Finance searches are moving into the final stages. President Papazian will interview the finalists.

   b. **From the Provost** –
      The provost will be sending out a message to the campus regarding increased safety and security measures being taken at the MLK Library next week. A security officer will now be sitting at the desk at all times and not walking around. In addition, there will be an increase in UPD officers patrolling the library, and UPD will be coordinating efforts with the San José Police Department.

      The committee discussed concerns about the increased pressure on department chairs and why the faculty in some departments is divided. Provost Feinstein sees this in split votes for department chairs and this is making it more difficult to recruit and retain department chairs. Provost Feinstein asked the committee to provide him with feedback about what the issues are and possible solutions. Several members suggested more training for department chairs.

      The university is on track to hire approximately 80 faculty members this year.
c. **From the Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA)** –
The VPSA recently met with graduate students from around the world in the *Pathways to Graduation* open forums. VP Blaylock thanked all the faculty. These forums were well received and this is largely due to the number of faculty that showed up.

Student Affairs will be moving into the new Student Union on March 25, 2016. Both Subway and Starbucks are already open.

The *Coffee with Professors* program has been launched. Students are encouraged to apply to take their professors out for coffee.

VP Blaylock announced there would be about a dozen faculty in residence living with our students on campus. A member asked about whether married faculty could apply. VP Blaylock said yes, and both the cost of housing and the meals are covered for these faculty members. However, the faculty in residence cannot be lecturers.

d. **From the Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF)** –
There will be a final test of the Emergency Broadcast System this week. In addition, a pilot program using external cameras will be launched within the next 30 days.

The committee discussed the 7th Street Garage and how people leaving from the disabled parking will access San Salvador. Interim VP Larochelle will find out the details and report back to the committee.

e. **From the Vice President for University Advancement (VPUA)** –
The Board of Trustees approved the naming of the Student Union. There are three additional naming opportunities in the pipeline.

University Advancement has hired a new Planned Giving Officer.

University Advancement is already working on finding potential donors for the new Science Building.

f. **From the CSU Statewide Senator** –
There is concern in the CSU Statewide Senate over the perceived erosion of shared governance within the Chancellor’s Office.

At the next CSU Statewide Senate meeting they will be discussing a resolution calling for greater scrutiny of online classes. The committee discussed issues with requiring students to take summer remediation classes. Many of these
students don’t have the skills, and/or necessary equipment (e.g. computers) to take these online summer remediation classes.

g. **University Library Board (ULB)** –
The ULB is developing materials that will show people what resources are available in the library. This is in response to the underutilization of some services.

The search for a new Dean of the Library is progressing.

h. **Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R)** –
C&R will not be bringing the Physical Education Waiver proposal back to the Senate. Chair Mathur discussed the Senate’s concerns with the AVP of GUP and she was willing to drop the matter

C&R will be bringing a resolution on restoring options for students with quantitative reasoning to the Senate at the next meeting.

C&R is also working on a resolution to remove the exemplar that shows a charge for proctoring is allowed from the policy regarding test taking procedures.

In addition, C&R is working on a Sense of the Senate Resolution in support of Affordable Textbooks. A resolution is required for SJSU to get a grant. A member reminded the committee that we do have a resolution on affordable textbooks already and it is SS-S06-5. However, this resolution was structured more towards early adoption of textbooks and clear communication between the bookstore and faculty. The committee discussed that textbook authors are being penalized even though research shows that students do better with hard copies of books than the online versions.

i. **Organization and Government Committee (O&G)** –
O&G is working on a Voting Rights Policy that will either come as a first reading by the end of the semester, or be brought in the fall instead.

O&G has amended the Remote Attendance Policy to remove allowing remote attendance at Executive Committee meetings, but will still allow remote attendance at Senate meetings if the Senate Chair agrees to it and technology is available. Several members discussed possible amendments that could be made on the floor of the Senate.

O&G will be bringing the Electronic Voting Policy for a final reading at the next Senate meeting.
j. **Professional Standards Committee (PS)** –

PS is working on a resolution to amend the RTP procedures in relation to the election of a general unit representative.

PS is also working on a Sense of the Senate Resolution calling for widespread consultation regarding electronic communication changes.

In addition, PS will be working on an amendment to S15-6 regarding how documents received by recruitment committees are handled.

PS is also reviewing how program coordinators are chosen and removed. There are currently no policies on this.

3. The committee discussed the College of Business Dean Search Committee. Since this was a failed search, a new search will begin soon. The current committee has a Faculty-at-Large (FAL) member but if the amendment to the Selection and Review of Administrators Policy passes in the Senate at the next meeting, search committees will replace the FAL with a Dean. The committee discussed whether the FAL could remain on the committee, or would this person would have to be removed. The committee suggested the amendment include a transitional phase.

4. The committee discussed whether the Vice President of University Advancement (VPUA) needed to be on the Executive Committee and the Senate, or would his time be better utilized on fundraising activities. A member noted that removing the VPUA from the Senate would require constitutional amendment which would mean a campus-wide faculty vote. However, removing him from the Executive Committee would only require a bylaw amendment.

5. The meeting adjourned at 1:32 p.m.
Executive Committee Meeting Minutes  
April 11, 2016  
12-1:30 ADM 167

Present: Kimbarow, Martin, Peter, Frazier, Shifflett, Heiden, Feinstein, Backer, Larochelle, Lee, Mathur, Blaylock, Lanning, Amante

Absent: Kaufman

1. Approval of 3/21/16 meeting minutes.

M/S/To approve the minutes with corrections of 3/21/16 (9-0-1).

2. Consent Calendar

There is no dissent to the consent calendar.

3. Policy Committee Updates:

   a. C & R

   Chair Mathur reported that C&R is looking at its third ORTU. The internship policy should be brought back to Senate on 4/25. They are moving forward with a Sense of the Senate resolution regarding AB 798 (Affordable Textbook Act). There are three other initiatives: certificate policy revision, continuing with Program Planning policy, and a new RSCA referral.

   There was a discussion of the overlap for concentrations. The Chancellor's office wants a 51% overlap in content for all concentrations. There are many concentrations out of compliance with this new rule. C&R will ask AVP Anagnos to notify the campus.

   b. ISA

   There was no report by ISA. ISA Chair Kaufman is at a conference.

   c. O&G

   O&G Chair Bethany Shifflett announced there will be three final readings (remote attendance, committee attendance and Senate membership, electronic voting) brought to the next Senate meeting. There will be two first readings (update to the Voting Rights Policy and Bylaw 1.2). SSP II and III have been moved to Bargaining Unit 4 so our bylaws need to be updated to reflect this.

   d. PS
The rescinding of the responsible use policy is going to be brought to the next Senate meeting. The policy regarding information privacy will be pulled and worked over more—tentative submission to the Senate is Fall. PS continues to receive revisions to department guidelines. One revision has been approved.

PS is reviewing the email usage document. This will be a Sense of the Senate resolution. The committee discussed the reluctance of some faculty to use their SJSU accounts. There are many other issues involved. Senator Lee pointed out that we need to make sure that we are following FERPA and the law.

PS is bringing small amendments to the appointments policy and the RTP policy. There is a section of procedures that govern all personnel committees. It has to be reproduced in the appointments policy. The choosing of personnel committees for RTP committees by secret ballot needs to be added to the RTP policy.

The new tentative CFA/CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement includes release time for faculty by extending the Allocation of Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students. We have a temporary policy (S15-1) set to expire on 9-1-17. It needs to be revised. Provost Feinstein noted this was an unfunded mandate from the CSU.

Student Evaluation Review Board is working on a revision to the survey questions.

4. Updates:

   a. Senate Chair

Today was the first Campus Conversation to get campus input on the SJSU Campus Climate Survey. Chair Kimbarow attended the SJSU Senate Chairs meeting. There appears to be some dysfunctionality among the CSUs with respect to shared governance.

   b. Provost

Provost Feinstein sent a draft Student Success draft. He requests that the Senate Executive committee should send their comments to him. VP Blaylock and he plan on holding a retreat this summer about the plan.

A question was asked about the Summer Bridge funding under SSETF. Are the funds being used inappropriately because AY funds are being used for students in a summer bridge program are funds from the previous AY?
The deans have discussed S14-8 (Selection and Review of Department Chairs and Directors) and discussed issues related to this document for the appointment of chairs. Provost Feinstein will send the concerns to PS and issues related to voting to O&G.

Provost Feinstein discussed that it is unclear how the pay raises identified in the new contract will be paid.

Senator Lee discussed that the gap in pay is not addressed by the new contract.

c. VP Student Affairs

VP Blaylock spent a full day in Sacramento two weeks ago with two students (LouLou Amante and Cole). He met with several legislators to discuss the values of SJSU.

We are coming to the end of the Chief Diversity Officer hiring process. The committee was great and met during Spring Break.

Tonight is the fourth brother-to-brother dinner. Students are taking leadership into these conversations. Two seniors are co-facilitating the dialog.

Saturday is Admitted Spartan Day. We have 10,000 RSVPs for Saturday. There is a reception on Saturday for about 200 underrepresented students on Saturday.

d. VP Administration and Finance

FDO wants to paint some buildings: Faculty Office Building, Morris Dailey and the AS House. Can we start in May—this way, the scaffolding will be outside the buildings during finals. The consensus is that FDO should wait until after the Spring semester ends to start painting.

e. VP Advancement

The endowment returns will be 3% based on the investments this year. The best way to grown endowments is through new money.

The Koret Foundation has committed $2 million available as of July 1. $400K will go to student scholarships; the remaining $1.6 million is being worked on by Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. SJSU is looking at funds to using technology tools to support advising. After 9 months this year, we have raised $41.5 million.

The gala ended in the black.

f. Statewide Senate
Senator Lee pointed out that many departments don’t understand the relationship between department scholarships and the aid levels allowed for individual students.

g. Associated Students

AS has voted on the new position descriptions for the restructuring of AS. On March 13-14, she brought 10 students to Sacramento to lobby. AS is collaborating with Spartan Shops on Spartan Thursday. It was a big day of advocating—Senator Amante went with the SJSU President to Washington.

This year, there are six people running for AS President.

23 campus delegates are coming to SJSU on Saturday.

h. Library Board—no report

We will move remaining agenda items to next week’s meeting.

5. COIA Rep

Senator Backer suggested that the COIA representative should be a member of the Athletics Board and also discussed the value of having someone from the Senate serve as the COIA rep.

6. Removing VP Advancement from the Academic Senate.

Chair Kimbarow noted that the Executive Committee did not reach a decision on removing the VP Advancement from the Senate and Executive Committee. Kimbarow also raised the question as to whether it would be appropriate for the CDO to serve Senate and Executive Committee.

The Senate Executive Committee discussed this issue. President Martin recommended that this decision should be delayed until next year but the Academic Senate should invite the new CDO to the Senate and Executive Committee meetings.

7. Senate Representatives

The bylaws state that if there are openings, the elected members of a college should give input to the Executive Committee about filling the vacancies.

a. H & A
b. COB
c. GU
8. ExCom Nominating Committee

9. Continued Discussion Senate/ExCom membership

   Next meeting: 4/18/16
   Leadership Development: Dept. Chairs
   AA/SA Student Success Plan
   SOS Honorary Senator
   SOS You Can Play
   At-large committee positions.

10. The meeting adjourned at 1:31 p.m.

These minutes were taken by AVC Patricia Backer on April 11, 2016, and edited by Chair Michael Kimbarow on April 13, 2016. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on April 18, 2016.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Standards</td>
<td>Joseph Rios</td>
<td>Student Senator</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Diversity</td>
<td>Joseph Rios</td>
<td>AS Director of Campus Climate Affairs</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics Board</td>
<td>Sen Chiao</td>
<td>Fac. Ath. Rep</td>
<td>EXO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility</td>
<td>Scot Guenter</td>
<td>Humanities &amp; the Arts</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of General Studies</td>
<td>Revathi Krishnaswamy</td>
<td>Faculty-Humanities &amp; the Arts</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Success</td>
<td>Julio Soto</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics Board</td>
<td>BJ Campsey</td>
<td>Fac. Ath. Rep</td>
<td>EXO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
San José State University
Academic Senate  AS 1583
Curriculum and Research Committee
April 25, 2016
Final Reading

Policy Recommendation:
Internships, Service Learning, and Off-Campus Learning Experiences

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…”

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), most of which are credit bearing or are an academic requirement and are therefore covered by Executive Order 1064; 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 Graduate and Undergraduate Programs (GUP) and designated offices (e.g., Center for Community Learning and Leadership; CCLL) and when changes are needed in the general 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 UOA template for its Internships,
Service Learning, and Off-Campus Learning Experiences but can modify it, as
needed, in consultation with Administration and Finance (e.g., Contracts and
Purchasing, Risk Management) and the Office of Graduate and Undergraduate
Programs; and be it further

Resolved That 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, service
learning, or off-campus experience and the students involved are in agreement
about the nature of the academic requirements and expected outcomes; and be
it further

Resolved That the outcomes of the LP relate to the course learning outcomes or
the program learning outcomes; and be it further

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

Resolved That the campus investigate and implement solutions to streamline and develop
a more facile process for establishing agreements with partner sites; 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): April 21, 2016 (electronic vote)
Vote: 12-0-0
Present: Anagnos, Bacich, Backer, Buzanski, Clements, Heil, Mathur, Matoush,
Sarras, Schultz-Krohn, Sibley, Stacks
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.

**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
- what percentage of the organizations that a department is working with already have a non-expired UOA on file
- to what extent new organizations in the process of signing a UOA request changes/amendments to their agreements

Workload impact will also be tied to the agreed upon processes for handling UOAs within SJSU.
Senate Management Resolution

Remote Attendance at Senate and Committee Meetings

Legislative History: Modification of Senate standing rule 17 which pertains to committee meetings.

Whereas: Requests have been received from members of the Executive Committee and members of policy and operating committees to participate in meetings via teleconferencing, and
Whereas: Senate by-laws clearly establish expectations and standards for attendance at Senate and committee meetings but are silent on whether participating via teleconferencing or web-based conferencing fulfills the attendance requirements, and
Whereas: Remote attendance is a senate management issue and best addressed through the Senate’s standing rules, and
Whereas: Guidance is needed on remote attendance for members and committee chairs, and
Whereas: Viewpoints and needs associated with in-person requirements can vary, but access, quality, and participation are shared values, therefore be it

Resolved That language be added to standing rule 17 to provide guidelines regarding remote attendance at Senate and committee meetings as noted in this senate management resolution.

Rationale: The option to attend meetings from a remote location is potentially beneficial in terms of morale (e.g., balance domestic and work obligations, commuting distance). Given the expansion of technological tools that facilitate remote communication some amount of flexibility should be available regarding meeting attendance. However, the standing practice has been in-person attendance. In addition, (a) campus resources may not be robust or reliable enough, depending on the location, to make remote attendance feasible, (b) the availability of technical support, or lack thereof, for committee chairs will likely influence the viability of remote attendance, and c) the work of the executive committee, based on past experience, has been facilitated through direct exchanges among members. The burden of arranging for accommodations should not fall on the committee chair, thus the bylaws place that responsibility on the individuals requesting remote attendance. Of utmost importance is the quality of the exchange of ideas and information. The level of quality associated with in-person attendance should be maintained.
Approved: 4/11/16
Vote: 7-0-0
Present: Mathur, Gleixner, Shifflett, Beyersdorf, Becker, Curry, Laker
Absent: Romero, Grosvenor

Financial Impact: None expected.
Workload Impact: Potential increase for committee chairs with regard to planning, organization, and management of meetings.

Modification to Standing Rule 17: add item g (1 through 4):

g) Remote Attendance

1) Executive Committee of the Senate: No remote attendance is permitted.

2) Academic Senate: Any action taken by the Senate requires the presence of a quorum of the elected members in person. Members of the Senate are expected to attend meetings in person. At the discretion of the Senate chair remote attendance may be permitted when appropriate and reliable resources are available and the work of the Senate will not be compromised. Such accommodations should be rare. The individual requesting remote attendance is responsible for making all necessary arrangements needed to facilitate remote attendance.

3) Policy Committees: Members of policy committees are expected to attend meetings in person. At the discretion of the policy committee chair remote attendance may be permitted when appropriate and reliable resources are available and the work of the committee will not be compromised. Such accommodations should be rare. The individual requesting remote attendance is responsible for making all necessary arrangements needed to facilitate remote attendance.

4) Operating Committees, Special Agencies, Special Committees, Other Committees: Members of operating committees, special agencies, ‘other’, and special committees are expected to attend meetings in person. At the discretion of the committee chair remote attendance may be permitted when appropriate and reliable resources are available and the work of the committee will not be compromised. The individual requesting remote attendance is responsible for making all necessary arrangements needed to facilitate remote attendance.
Policy Recommendation
Committee Obligations & Senate Membership
(modification of bylaw 6)

Legislative History: Modification of existing by-law 6.

Whereas: The full engagement of senators in committee assignments is inextricably linked to their participation on the senate, and
Whereas: Senate by-laws clearly establish expectations and standards for attendance, and
Whereas: The primary responsibilities of the senate have been and remain the development of policy recommendations which requires the participation of senators on assigned committees, and
Whereas: Clarification regarding the connection between committee responsibilities and senate service is needed, therefore be it Resolved: That Senate bylaws 6.10, 6.12, and 6.13 be modified as noted in this policy recommendation.

Rationale: This policy recommendation is designed to match the changes to bylaw 1.6.2 passed at the March 2016 Senate meeting to provide clarification related to the connection between policy committee membership and senate membership. This recommendation also clarifies the process for removing members (non ex officio) from Senate committees.

Approved: 4/11/16
Vote: 6-0-1
Present: Mathur, Shifflett, Beyersdorf, Becker, Laker, Curry, Gleixner
Absent: Grosvenor, Romero
Financial Impact: None expected
Workload Impact: No changes
Bylaw 6. Standing Committees

6.1 The Academic Senate shall establish and appoint such standing committees as may be needed.

6.2 Except as otherwise provided in these bylaws, appointments to policy committees of the Academic Senate shall be recommended by the elected members of the Executive Committee and approved by the Senate; appointments to operating committees shall be recommended by the Committee on Committees and approved by the Senate. When an appointment is recommended more than one week before the next regular meeting of the Senate, the recommending body may make its recommendation effective at once as a temporary appointment. These temporary appointments shall last until the next meeting of the Senate and must receive Senate approval to become permanent.

6.3 Committees concerned primarily with faculty affairs shall contain a majority of teaching faculty with full-time appointments. Committees concerned with student affairs shall contain a significant proportion, but not a majority, of students.

6.4 For purposes of service on Senate committees, all university staff, academic or other, full or part-time, active or retired, and all students and alumni shall be considered members of the university community.

6.5 Recommendation of students for membership on operating committees shall be made according to the recommendation procedures of the Associated Students, Inc. and should be transmitted to the Associate Vice Chair by the first meeting of the new Academic Senate for final approval by the Senate. The Associated Students, Inc. should give student appointments to the Student Fairness Committee a high priority.

Recommendations for appointment to policy committees of student members of the Senate and student policy committee representatives shall be transmitted to the Associate Vice Chair by the Associated Student's, Inc. Board of Directors, acting in accordance with the appointment rules and nomination procedures of that organization. The recommendations should be transmitted to the Associate Vice Chair by the second meeting of the new Academic Senate.

When appointments have been approved by the Senate, the Senate Administrator shall notify those appointed.

6.5.1 Should the Associated Students, Inc. Board of Directors not transmit recommendations of students for membership on Senate operating committees or policy committees by the fourth week of instruction, the following shall supersede the rules of the Associated Students, Inc. for
90 nomination of students to policy and operating committees: student seats shall become university student-at-large seats for the balance of the academic year. These seats may be filled by any student in good standing at the university who self nominates or who is nominated by a member of the Academic Senate, and who is recommended by the elected members of the Executive Committee and approved by the Senate (subject to bylaw 6.2). All student nominees shall submit a statement of purpose to the Executive Committee.

6.5.2 Should a vacancy occur, the President of Associated Students, Inc. shall select a replacement to fill out the remainder of the term. This selection must be approved by a two-thirds majority of the total membership of the Board of Directors of the Associated Students, Inc. The name of the nominee should be transmitted to the Associate Vice Chair within 30 days of the time that the vacancy occurred for final approval by the Senate. When the appointment has been approved by the Senate, the Senate Administrator shall notify the appointee. If a nomination is not received within 30 days, the seat will be declared a student-at-large seat for the balance of the academic year and will be filled as per 6.5.1.

6.6 The establishment or elimination of any regular policy committee shall require a two-thirds (2/3) majority of the Senate.

6.7 Policy committees shall report to the Academic Senate. Committee recommendations within the report shall show the names of the committee members present and the vote totals. All operating committees shall report to the designated standing policy committees.

6.7.1 All policy recommendations shall include

a) A statement of the rationale of the policy, including its source, intent and claimed need in language suitable for communication to faculty, staff and students affected;

b) Either the policy committee’s finding that the recommended policy is not expected to have any significant financial impact, or an estimate, obtained from a named body or person responsible for implementing the policy, of the approximate direct cost or saving to the university if the recommended policy is adopted;

c) A statement of the likely workload impact of the policy, that is, whether and how much compliance will increase or decrease required activity or expenditure of time by faculty, staff, or students.

6.8 Except as otherwise provided in these bylaws, chairs of operating committees shall be elected by the committee. Any member of the committee,
except an ex officio member, is eligible as chair. Chairs of policy committees
shall be elected annually by the Senate from its faculty representatives.
Nominees for Chair of Professional Standards must be tenured full professors.

6.9 a) All policy committee appointments shall be for one year, commencing
with the first meeting of the Senate for the year (in the last month of the
Spring semester).

b) Seniority shall not be the primary factor in selecting members of policy
committees.

c) Tenured faculty should be given priority for appointment to the
Professional Standards Committee.

6.10 Policy committees shall normally be composed so that at least one half of
the members of a policy committee are also members of the Senate. Thus, all
Senators will normally be appointed to a policy committee prior to appointments
of faculty who are not senators. Generally, no person shall serve on more than
one policy committee. Exceptions may be made for the President of the
Associated Students, officers of the Senate, and university administrators.
Members of Senate policy committees, including ex officio members, can vote
and be counted for quorum only if present in person.

6.10.1 Normally, one faculty member from each of the units from which
faculty representatives are elected is assigned to each policy committee.
In no instance shall more than two faculty members from any of the units
from which faculty representatives are elected be assigned to one policy
committee.

6.10.2 The senators representing the Emeritus Faculty Association and
the Alumni Association are eligible for appointment to policy committees
with the exception of the Professional Standards Committee. If they wish
to serve, they shall, at the beginning of the academic year, request
appointment. They may request a specific committee assignment; they
may not serve on the same committee. Requests shall be made to the
Executive Committee. When appointed, they shall have the status of ex
officio members.

6.11 Appointments of faculty to operating committees shall be for staggered
three- year terms unless otherwise specified. After service for a full three-year
term, members should be reappointed only in special circumstances. Appropriate
administrative officers or their officers or designees shall be included on
operating committees as ex officio members.

Student membership on operating committees is normally for a one-year term.
Near the end of each spring semester, each operating committee shall elect from among its membership, a chair for the following academic year. The outgoing committee chair shall recommend through the appropriate policy committees to the Committee on Committees any changes in committee responsibility or organization.

6.12 a) If a member (non ex officio) of an Academic Senate committee (policy, operating, other, special or special agency) cannot complete the term for any reason, the chair of the committee may request, through the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate, that a replacement be appointed. The Associate Vice Chair, using the normal procedures of the Committee on Committees then solicits nominations for a replacement and brings a recommendation to the Executive Committee and subsequently the Senate via the consent calendar.

b) If a member (non ex officio) of an Academic Senate committee (policy, operating, other, special or special agency) is absent from three regularly scheduled committee meetings in an academic year or repeatedly does not perform assigned committee duties, the chair of the committee may request, through the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate, that the person be removed from the committee. The Associate Vice Chair, following discussion with and approval from the Executive Committee for removal of the committee member will then solicit nominations for a replacement (or notify the relevant college if an election is needed) and bring a recommendation to the Executive Committee and subsequently the Senate via the consent calendar.

c) Removal of a senator from their assigned policy committee will result in removal from the Senate.

6.13 a) Notwithstanding the provisions of bylaw 6.10.1, and excluding seats for which an election is required, college seats on policy committees, operating committees, special agencies, ‘other’ committees or special committees, for which no faculty from that college willing to serve have been found and which remain vacant after the fourth week of instruction in the fall semester shall become faculty-at-large seats for the balance of the academic year.

b) Following the third week of instruction, the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate shall inform each college representative and college dean which of that college’s committee seats are still vacant and invite them to recommend faculty for those seats within one week’s time. The college representative and deans shall be reminded that the seats will become faculty-at-large seats for the year if no college faculty to fill them can be found. The dean’s recommendations shall be forwarded to the college’s Committee on Committees representatives who shall present one name to
the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate to be reported to the Senate or to
the Executive Committee, as appropriate under bylaw 6.2.

c) Following the fourth week of instruction, all vacant college seats on
committees for which no faculty from the college have been recommended
under paragraph (b) above (or otherwise identified) shall become faculty-
at-large seats for the balance of the year and all members of the
Committee on Committees shall be requested to supply names of faculty
from any representative unit to fill these vacancies.

d) Following the third week of instruction, all vacant college seats on
committees shall become faculty-at-large seats for the balance of the
year (except as noted in part (a) above). First priority in filling these
vacancies shall be given to elected faculty representatives not assigned to
other policy committees. If all elected faculty representatives (other than
Senate officers) have been appointed to policy committees and there are
policy committee seats still remaining vacant, they shall be filled as
provided in 6.13(b) and (c) above.

e) The Associate Vice Chair of the Senate shall coordinate this selection
process so as to maintain as far as possible a representative balance
across committees and shall report one name for each vacancy to the
Senate or the Executive Committee as appropriate under bylaw 6.2.

f) Elected faculty representatives (other than Senate officers) not
appointed to seats designated for representative units and also not
appointed to faculty-at-large seats as provided above shall be appointed
as additional members-at-large of policy committees. If there is only one
such member, s/he shall be appointed to the Organization and
Government Committee. If there is a second, s/he shall be appointed to
the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee. A third shall be appointed
to the Professional Standards Committee and a fourth to the Curriculum
and Research Committee. The provision shall be implemented in a
manner consistent with Academic Senate bylaw 6.10.1.
San Jose State University  
Academic Senate  
Organization and Government Committee  
AS 1605  
April 25, 2016  
Final Reading  

Senate Management Resolution  
Electronic Voting  

Legislative History: Modification of Senate standing rule 3 to allow for electronic voting and clarify the voting procedure.  

Whereas: Depending on the issue, voting by the academic senate has been known to take a considerable amount of time, and  
Whereas: Recently the senate acquired electronic devices that could record and display votes as they occur, and  
Whereas: Clarification is needed regarding the allowed methods of voting, therefore be it  
Resolved: That Senate standing rule 3 be modified as suggested in this resolution, and be it further  
Resolved: That on sensitive matters, or matters when undue administrative pressure might be brought to bear, the chair of the senate shall declare a vote to be by secret ballot, and be it further  
Resolved: That secret ballots may be cast electronically, and be it further  
Resolved: That except in circumstances where a secret ballot is necessary, the use of electronic devices for official voting shall be done in parallel with an unofficial show of hands.  

Rationale: The use of electronic devices has the potential to streamline certain elections, such as those where secret ballots are required, and/or multiple run-off elections are expected, however, other times a show-of-hands is expected to be more efficient.  

Approved: 4/11/16  
Vote: 7-0-0  
Present: Shifflett, Beyersdorf, Becker, Curry, Mathur, Laker, Gleixner  
Absent: Grosvenor, Romero  
Financial Impact: None expected  
Workload Impact: Increased work for senate administration to administer electronic devices, slightly offset by the reduced work in tallying votes.  

Standing Rule 3 Modification Recommended:
3. Voting

a) Electronic Voting. The senate chair shall determine on a case-by-case basis if official voting will be offered by a show of hands, or through the use of electronic devices in concert with a show of hand. The decision shall be guided by the expected efficiency of each method.

b) Secret Ballot Voting. A secret ballot shall be required on all personnel matters except committee appointments. For all other matters, upon the request of any member and supported by five additional members, a secret ballot is also required. If voting is done electronically, no show of hands will accompany the electronic vote. A roll call vote shall be ordered upon the request of any member and supported by five additional members. If the chair faces a situation where there has been a properly supported call for a vote by secret ballot, and also a properly supported call for a roll call vote, there shall be an immediate vote to decide which type of ballot is to be taken on the motion at hand.
Policy Recommendation:

Restoring Options for Students with Quantitative Reasoning Disabilities Affecting Math Skills

BACKGROUND

*Dyscalculia* is broadly defined as a learning disability in which affected persons have difficulty in learning and comprehending quantitative reasoning; and there is precedent in higher education (including in the CSU, at Long Beach, Chico, and Los Angeles) for waiver or substitution policies for quantitative reasoning requirements for those diagnosed with dyscalculia and other learning disabilities; and Title 5 (40405.1) permits each campus the right of discretion regarding the number and disposition of GE units so long as the total units are not fewer than 48 (semester); and section 40405.4 allows for exceptions in individual cases of demonstrable hardship; and Executive Order 1065 affirms this in 2.2.5 (Exceptions) permitting the campus to grant (in the case of an individual student) an exception to one or more of the particular requirements of Section 40405.1.

WHEREAS SJSU has an obligation to provide suitable academic pathways and reasonable accommodations to students it admits; and

WHEREAS SJSU has never had a quantitative reasoning *waiver* policy though SJSU had a *substitution* process from the 1980’s until 2008; and SJSU had a different substitution process from 2008 – 2010, after which the substitution process was terminated by the Office of Undergraduate Studies; therefore be it

RESOLVED A *substitution* process be available for all matriculated students identified as having dyscalculia, or a disability related to a quantitative reasoning impairment, verified by the Accessible Education Center (AEC), for whom required completion of a B4 class (and developmental math courses) will effectively prevent the student from ever completing a baccalaureate degree; and be it further
RESOLVED The process shall honor CSU commitments to critical thinking and logical reasoning consistent with the overall aims of the GE program while respecting the requirements of SJSU degree programs; and be it further

RESOLVED This substitution of the B4 requirement be determined through the collaborative efforts of the SJSU degree program (or, in the case of an undeclared student, the intended degree program), a representative from AEC, and a representative from the Office of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs; and be it further

RESOLVED If the department deems that the B4 requirement is essential for success in a specific degree program then the substitution will not be permitted for that program; and be it further

RESOLVED This policy shall be adopted in time to be effective for those students matriculating for the first time at SJSU in Fall 2016.

Approved (C&R): April 11, 2016
Vote: 8-0-0
Present: Anagnos, Buzanski, Clements, Heil, Mathur, Schultz-Krohn, Sibley, Stacks
Absent: Bacich, Backer, Matoush, Sarras
Curricular Impact: None anticipated.
Financial Impact: None anticipated.
Workload Impact: Additional workload for curricular programs who choose to work with the student, Accessibility Education Center, and the Office of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs to identify a reasonable accommodation.
Policy Recommendation:
Student Rights and Responsibilities

Whereas: There have been significant changes in student rights and responsibilities since 1990, and

Whereas: Referencing and maintaining all relevant information is impractical in a static policy; therefore, be it

Resolved: That University Policies S90-5 and S98-6 be rescinded and replaced with the attached policy.

Approved: March 21, 2016
Vote: 13 - 0 - 1
Present: Brooks, Bruck (non-voting), Rees, Sen, Campsey, Walters, Medina, Branz (non-voting), Kaufman, Sofish, Medrano, Khan, Wilson, Simpson, Nash, Abukhdeir
Absent: Amante, Gay, Sen, Sullivan-Green
Financial Impact: No significant impact
Workload impact: Slight increase for I&SA Committee in reviewing changes up to twice per year as well as slight increase for university webmaster in updating the page of links.
Student Rights and Responsibilities

PREAMBLE

Academic institutions exist for the transmission of knowledge, the pursuit of truth, the intellectual growth of students, and the general well being of society. As members of the academic community, students should be encouraged to develop critical judgment and to engage in a sustained and independent search for truth. Freedom of inquiry, expression, and action are indispensable to the attainment of these goals. Therefore, the academic community must not only permit, but also encourage all forms of action which do not interfere with the rights of other individuals or groups or with the essential functions of the academic community.

Students, as members of the academic community, accept both the rights and responsibilities incumbent upon all members of the institution. To the extent that their rights as students are not denied, students acknowledge the authority of the faculty in matters of scholarship and the authority of faculty and administrators in operating the university. Concomitantly, the faculty and administration realize and respect the rights of students to help in formulating university policies. Students also have the right to challenge the ideas of others without fear of retaliation, to work for change believed necessary for the improvement of the institution and to challenge any attempt to deprive them of their rights.

Applicable policies and procedures attempt to define both the student’s freedom and the limits of that freedom. They are based on the principles that membership in the academic community involves rights and responsibilities and that all rights, privileges, and responsibilities which accrue to the student as such are not abridged by membership in the academic community.

Corollary to any statement of student rights and responsibilities are procedures for hearing charges that students' rights have been denied either by other students, the faculty, administration, or staff of the university. This policy references the policies and procedures by which these rights and the freedom of all segments of the university community may be protected.

While considering students' rights and responsibilities, it must be recognized that the campus is not a sanctuary immune from civil authority and law, and that students may be prosecuted for violation of the law, whether an action occurs on the campus or off; however, university sanctions will be imposed only for those violations that directly and significantly interfere with the university's responsibilities for ensuring the opportunities of all members of the academic community.
community to pursue learning. This statement concerning Student Rights and Responsibilities is subject to and limited by all applicable provisions of the Constitution of the United States and of State law including the regulations and orders duly made by the Trustees and the Chancellor of the California State University.

**Applicable Policies and Procedures:**
The university shall maintain an electronic repository of all laws, policies, procedures, etc. that are applicable to the general area of Student Rights and Responsibilities. Twice per year, the members of the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) of the Academic Senate shall review the precise contents of this page. The review shall be completed in November for changes to take effect the following spring, and April for changes to take effect the following fall; this will allow faculty and students time to become familiar with upcoming changes to the required language. Authority for approving changes in the list of links rests only with I&SA. The list of links will be hosted under the “Current Students” tab on the university homepage, as well as in the catalog and on the web sites of appropriate offices, including, at a minimum, Academic Affairs, Accessible Education Center, Associated Students, Athletics, college and departmental web sites, Enrollment Services, Graduate and Undergraduate Programs, Housing, Human Resources, Registrar, Student Academic Success Services, Student Affairs, Student Conduct, Student Services, and University Ombudsperson web sites.

NOTE: the following two pages contain lists of (a) the list of items covered in the current policy and (b) a proposed list based on current laws, policies, etc. that apply to student rights and responsibilities. These lists are not exhaustive.
STUDENT RESPONSIBILITIES AND RIGHTS (CURRENT) DISTRIBUTED AMONG MANY WEB LOCATIONS

University Policies
Academic Standards
Attendance Policy
Academic Integrity Policy
Complaints
Complaint Procedures - Alleged Violations of State Law
Educational Equity
Equal Opportunity
Disciplinary Action Statement
Student Fairness Committee
Ombudsperson
Student Conduct & Ethical Development
Student Conduct Standards
Student Conduct Procedures
Student Discipline and Conduct
Student Disciplinary Process
California Code of Regulations
Drug-Free Schools Statement
Safety Report
Sexual Harassment
Regulation - Nondiscrimination Policies
Health Policies
Privacy Rights of Students in Education Records
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Responsibilities and Rights (Proposed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Accommodations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Freedom and Artistic Expression</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attendance and Participation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discrimination, Harassment, and Retaliation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drug and Alcohol Use and Abuse</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Equity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Establishing a Committed Presence in Class</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Office Hours</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Examination, Evaluation, or Culminating Activity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade Disputes and Grievances</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grading</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Syllabi</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing License Agreement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leaves of Absence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious Holidays</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Conduct and Academic Integrity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Government</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Organizations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Records and Privacy Rights</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timely Feedback on Class Assignments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title IX</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What steps should I take if I feel my rights have been violated?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CSU and SJSU Administrative Items**
- [SJSU Policies](#)
- [Coded Memos](#)
- [Executive Orders](#)
- [Presidential Directives](#)
Policy Recommendation:

Amendment to F13-2, Technology Intensive, Hybrid and Online Courses and Programs

Amends: F13-2

Whereas: CSU Executive Order 1078 states that students cannot be charged additional miscellaneous courses fees other than for field trips and in university policy F13-2 there is a statement in II.A.1.c regarding extra fees that includes proctoring as an extra fee exemplar; therefore be it

Resolved: That the current II.A.1.c statement is removed and substituted with “c. Any course that requires students to pay extra fees for field trips (only allowable course fee according to CSU Executive Order 1078) must indicate so on the syllabus.”

Rationale: CSU Executive Order 1078 established the mandatory Student Success, Excellence and Technology Fee (SSETF) and noted that this fee replaced all existing miscellaneous course fees (with the exception of field trips). In some online and hybrid courses instructors have been requiring students to use proctoring services that are external to the course and/or to the university. The cost of these proctoring services constitute ‘extra fees’ and thus are not allowable by the executive order. This amendment corrects the error in the extra fees exemplar described in the F13-2 policy.

Approved (C&R): April 11, 2016

Vote: 8-0-0

Present: Anagnos, Buzanski, Clements, Heil, Mathur, Schultz-Krohn, Sibley, Stacks

Absent: Bacich, Backer, Matoush, Sarras

Curricular Impact: None anticipated.

Financial Impact: None anticipated.

Workload Impact: None anticipated.
POLICY

RECOMMENDATION

Rescinds S02-8 (Information Technology Resources Responsible Use Policy)

Resolved: That S02-8 be rescinded, effective immediately.

Resolved: That the Information Security Officer draft any necessary guidelines to assist the campus in implementing and complying with the CSU Responsible Use component of the CSU Information Security Policy (8105), and forward those guidelines for Senate recommendation via the Executive Committee.

Rationale: Clear guidance for faculty, staff, students, and administrators on the responsible use of technology resources is needed, but since the adoption of SJSU’s own responsible use policy in 2002, the CSU has created a system-wide policy, in the form of the 2013 Responsible Use policy component of the CSU’s Information Security Policy (https://www.calstate.edu/icsuam/sections/8000/8105.0.shtml). This CSU policy establishes basic responsibilities for all users, the CSU and campuses, and describes expectations for responsible use. It addresses a wide range relevant circumstances (e.g., network and information system integrity, trademarks and patents, and incidental use. It also covers

- Central and departmentally managed campus information assets.
- All users employed by campuses or any other person with access to campus information assets.
- All categories of information, regardless of the medium in which the information asset is held or transmitted (e.g. physical or electronic).
- Information technology facilities, applications, hardware systems, and network resources owned or managed by the CSU.

The existing SJSU policy is largely redundant. To the extent that SJSU needs specific guidelines of its own that goes beyond the CSU policy, they can be drafted and submitted for Senate recommendation in the same manner that S02-8 was originally drafted and submitted.
Approved: 2/15/16 in a different format by Organization and Government

Vote: 8-0-0
Present: Mathur, Shifflett, Beyersdorf, Becker, Romero, Laker, Curry, Grosvenor
Absent: Gleixner

Approved 3/21/16 by Professional Standards

Vote: 6-0-0
Present: Peter, Green, White, Lee, Virick, Sandoval-Rios
Absent: Kauppila, Riley, Hamedi-Hagh

Financial Impact: No changes over the previous policy.
Workload Impact: No changes over the previous policy.
Senate Management Resolution
Conferring the Title of Honorary Senator on
Dr. Judith Lessow-Hurley

Whereas: The Academic Senate may confer the title of Honorary Senator on any member of the university community for long and distinguished service, and

Whereas: During the course of her 35 years as a faculty member, Dr. Judith Lessow-Hurley served San José State University with honor and distinction, and

Whereas: Dr. Judith Lessow-Hurley’s service included 18 continuous years on the SJSU Academic Senate including seven-years on the Academic Senate of the California State University

Whereas: Dr. Judith Lessow-Hurley, with good judgment, integrity, and an inclusive approach to leadership, effectively chaired the SJSU Academic Senate for two years, therefore be it

Resolved: That in recognition of her outstanding contributions and service to San José State University, and in accordance with SM-F96-3, the Senate confers upon Dr. Judith Lessow-Hurley the title of Honorary Senator with all the rights and privileges thereof, and be it further

Resolved: That a copy of this resolution, signed by the Chair and the Executive Committee, be presented to Dr. Lessow-Hurley.

Approved: April 18, 2016

Vote: 14-1-0

Present: Kimbarow, Martin, Feinstein, Blaylock, Lanning, Larochelle, Amante, Frazier, Heiden, Lee, Backer, Mathur, Kaufman, Shifflett, Peter

Absent: None

Financial Impact: None expected

Workload Impact: No change
San José State University
Executive Committee AS 1615
April 25, 2016
Final Reading

Sense of the Senate Resolution
Promoting San José State University’s Support of the You Can Play Project

Whereas, San José State University is a diverse and inclusive campus dedicated to social justice and ensuring equal access and opportunity for students to succeed regardless of race, ethnicity, religion, gender, economic status, disability, or sexual orientation; and

Whereas, From an early age LGBT persons often experience shunning, hostility, bullying, and even extreme violence when participating in athletics at all levels, creating an unhealthy dynamic where LGBT athletes are closeted, talents are not developed, bigotry is fostered, and athletics becomes a symbol of intolerance.

Whereas, The You Can Play project is dedicated to ensuring equality, respect, and safety for all athletes regardless of sexual orientation; and

Whereas, You Can Play works to ensure that athletes are judged solely on talent, heart, desire and work ethic and not on the basis of sexual or gender identity; and

Whereas, According to You Can Play, sports is one of the realms of society where discrimination and slurs are too frequently tolerated, and

Whereas, Many teammates, coaches, and the broader university community believe that all athletes “who can play” should be welcomed, given equal opportunity, and accorded respect; and

Whereas, A number of college athletic conferences and a number of colleges and universities, including Notre Dame, The Ohio State University, UC Berkeley, Stanford, UCLA and Sacramento State University, have teamed up with You Can Play to promote equality in sports by producing video
messages for posting on the You Can Play website and
played at intercollegiate athletic events; and

Whereas, San José State University Athletics aims to provide a safe
and inclusive environment for all student athletes to succeed
regardless of their sexual orientation or identity; therefore be
it

Resolved, That San José State University actively supports the You
Can Play project; and be it further

Resolved, That San José State University allocate funds to promote the
principles and message of the You Can Play project through
activities and communications including, but not limited to,
the production, use, and distribution (including submission to
the You Can Play website) of a video reflecting SJSU’s
commitment to inclusive excellence.

Approved: April 21, 2016 by email vote
Vote: 14-0-1
Present: Kimbarow, Martin, Larochelle, Lanning, Blaylock, Feinstein,
Frazier, Backer, Lee, Kaufman, Mathur, Shifflett, Amante,
Peter, Heiden
Absent: None
POLICY RECOMMENDATION

Amending S15-6 to Clarify Procedures for Recruitment Committees

Resolved: That the following amendment be incorporated into S15-6, and edited into the public copies of S15-6; be it further

Resolved: That this amendment becomes effective for all searches beginning AY 2016-17.

3.0 Procedures for Initial Appointment

3.3 Recruitment committee procedures.

3.3.1 Recruitment committees shall be charged by the Dean or the Dean’s designee and shall sign an appropriate agreement to protect the confidentiality of candidate applications.

3.3.2 Faculty Affairs will provide all recruitment committees with comprehensive guidelines for organizing the recruiting process.

3.3.3 Recruitment committees shall evaluate all candidates for appointments to regular positions and determine the order of desirability of finalists for the position. The recommendation of a recruitment committee shall be approved by a simple majority of the committee; abstentions will not be counted when determining the committee recommendation. Abstentions will be counted as "present" for the purposes of establishing a quorum.

3.3.3.1 Committees shall provide a clear rationale for their recommendations to the Dean and to Faculty Affairs. The committee vote and the written recommendations of the committee, including the order of desirability of finalists, shall be recorded and signed by all committee members. When committee recommendations are not unanimous, reasons shall be stated for all votes cast. A statement of the reasons shall be included in a single report from the committee, with the possibility of a separate "minority" report. In either case, the confidentiality of voting shall be maintained, and signatures on the report(s) shall not indicate how individual members voted when recommendations are not unanimous.
3.3.2.1.1 Normally, offers shall be extended to candidates in the order recommended by the committee. If, however, information emerges after the committee makes its recommendation (e.g., a subsequent reference check) that calls the order of desirability into question, the committee shall be given the opportunity to change its recommendation.

3.3.2.1.2 In the event that the President (and his designees) cannot (for any reason) accept the recommendation of the committee, the search will

Rationale: When the ARTP policies were split apart for ease of use, a few procedures that under the old policy applied to “all committees” were not moved to the Appointments policy but remained behind in the RTP policy. This amendment restores these procedures to the Appointments policy.

Approved: April 11, 2016
Vote: 8-0-0
Present: Peter, Green, White, Lee, Virick, Kauppila, Sandoval-Rios, Hamedi-Hagh
Absent: Riley
Financial Impact: No changes over the previous policy.
Workload Impact: No changes over the previous policy.
SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
Academic Senate
Organization and Government Committee
Professional Standards Committee
April 25, 2016
Final Reading

As per AS 1617

Sense of the Senate Resolution
Calling for Widespread Consultation
Prior to Finalizing any Standards and/or Implementation Strategies
Pertaining to Electronic Communications

Resolved: That, prior to finalizing any standards and/or implementation strategies pertaining to electronic communications, the Information Security Officer share widely with faculty, staff, administrators and students the draft standard on Email and Campus Communication (http://its.sjsu.edu/docs/security/Standard_Email_Campus_Communication.pdf) and solicit input on revisions, and be it further

Resolved: That following campus consultation, a revised draft of the standard on Email and Campus Communication be shared with the Senate’s Professional Standards Committee to guide their development of a policy recommendation.

Rationale: The draft standards on email campus communication contain numerous important changes that would substantially alter how faculty, students, and staff communicate through electronic media at SJSU. Some of those changes may be inconvenient or controversial. It would be prudent to solicit the widest possible feedback in order to devise the least disruptive implementation, and to determine if the campus community can suggest alternatives or improvements to the Standard Email Campus Communication plan.

Approved: February 16, 2016 in a different format (part of a larger package) by Organization and Government
Vote: 8-0-0
Present: Mathur, Shifflett, Beyersdorf, Becker, Romero, Laker, Curry, Grosvenor
Absent: Gleixner

Approved: March 21, 2016 by Professional Standards
Vote: 8-0-0
Present: Peter, Green, White, Lee, Virick, Kauppila, Sandoval-Rios, Hamedi-Hagh
Absent: Riley

Financial Impact: No changes over the previous policy.
Workload Impact: Will require some workload as the Information Security Officer will need to devise and implement a campus wide consultation plan.
SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
Academic Senate
Professional Standards Committee
April 25, 2016 AS 1618
First Reading

POLICY RECOMMENDATION
Amending S15-7 to Clarify Secret Ballots for Choosing RTP Committees

Resolved: That the following amendments be incorporated into S15-7, and edited into
the public copies of S15-7; be it further
Resolved: That this amendment becomes effective beginning AY 2016-17.

3.1.3 Election of RTP members

3.1.3.1 At all levels, faculty shall be elected to serve on RTP committees by secret ballot.

3.1.3.2 Faculty elected to serve on RTP committees should consider that their participation affects the careers of colleagues as well as the well-being of students and the health of the University more generally. This service shall be their highest professional priority.

3.1.3.3 Candidates should verify their ability to serve during the scheduled meeting times. If necessary and feasible, Deans and Chairs should adjust members’ teaching schedules to accommodate their ability to attend the scheduled meetings. If an elected member has an unresolvable conflict with the meeting schedule, that member should promptly notify the Dean and Chair who should arrange to replace the member via a special election prior to the beginning of committee deliberations.

3.1.3.4 No one may serve during the same review cycle on more than one level of committee; membership on the University committee, a college committee, or a department committee precludes membership on the other two.

3.1.3.5 All departments with four or more active Professors are expected to provide members/nominees to higher level committees. Departments with three or fewer active Professors may provide members/nominees to higher level committees by supplementing their department level committee with external faculty (if needed) as per 3.2.7. A department with insufficient faculty to provide a representative to a College level committee may elect a representative from outside its department in a related discipline, or it may elect another department’s elected
representative as a designee to explain the department’s criteria and context to the College committee.

…………………………………………….

3.4.2 The members of the university committee will be elected by the probationary and tenured faculty unit employees from each college and the General Unit. Only faculty who have previously served on their College level committee are eligible to be elected. Each department in the college shall be informed of the pending selection and may nominate one person. Each college retention, tenure, and promotion committee will select at least two of those nominated to place before the electorate of its college. No one elected may serve as a member of a department or college retention, tenure, or promotion committee in the same Academic year.

3.4.2.1.1 An election for the representative from the General Unit will be conducted by the Senate Chair, who will first solicit nominations from the library faculty and the counseling faculty and then will conduct an election.

Rationale:

Secret ballots were required for recruitment committees but this requirement was inexplicably not inserted for RTP committees. Since probationary faculty vote for the members of RTP committees, forcing them to publically vote could expose them to coercive pressures, and this possibility should be avoided. The responsibility for election of the General Unit representative to the University RTP Committee is given to the Academic Senate, which similarly runs the General Unit elections for Senate.

Approved: April 11, 2016
Vote: 8-0-0
Present: Peter, Green, White, Lee, Virick, Kauppila, Sandoval-Rios, Hamedi-Hagh
Absent: Riley
Financial Impact: No changes over the previous policy.
Workload Impact: No changes over the previous policy.
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 Fall 2016 SOTEs and SOLATEs.

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

SERB has worked diligently over the course of two years to amend the existing SOTE and SOLATE survey instrument. The last time the instruments were changed was in 2004.

A draft was prepared too late last year (AY 2014-15) to be reviewed by the Senate, and Professional Standards reviewed a draft on August 31 provided by SERB. Professional Standards provided advice which resulted in some additional changes over the course of the year and the receipt of this draft in April.

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 they have provided.

One major change is the addition of the free-response section to the SOLATE instrument. Giving students the opportunity to go beyond the numerical ratings and write a free response is required by our policy but has inexplicably only been part of the SOTE instrument and not the SOLATE instrument. This will bring our laboratory evaluations into conformity with policy and allow students in lab courses the same opportunity to respond as students in other courses.

SERB added an informational question about how many hours students devote to course-related activities. The Chair of SERB indicated that this was intended "to facilitate evaluation of course workload relative to Carnegie units (Question 18 on the SOTE;
Question 14 on the SOLATE)" and that it "was added after discussions with department chairs and curriculum committees tasked with the duty of evaluating course workload." Members of the Professional Standards Committee are of mixed opinions about this rationale for a question on hours of student work.

Questions 14 and up on the SOTE and 10 and higher on the SOLATE are informational items and are not "normed" and compared between departments.

Approved: April 18, 2016
Vote: 8-0-0
Present: Peter, Green, White, Lee, Virick, Kauppila, Sandoval-Rios, Hamedi-Hagh
Absent: Riley
Financial Impact: No changes over the previous policy.
Workload Impact: Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics (IEA) will need to update the online questionnaires.
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 1-20 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
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

Please answer the following informational items:

14. How would you describe your efforts in this course?
   Extraordinary
   High
   Average
   Low
   Minimal

15. How often did you attend class?
   Almost always
   Often
   Occasionally
   Seldom
   Almost never

16. 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.)

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

18. During a typical week in this course, how many hours did you spend outside of class
on course-related activities (such as reading, completing assignments, studying, service
learning, field work, group work, etc.)?

(NOTE: This will be programmed to be answered as a number field, and the course units
will be added to the report, allowing users to easily divide the answer by the actual course
units to generate Carnegie Units.

19. Did any other student attempt to influence your answers on this survey?
   Yes
   No

20. Did your instructor attempt to influence your answers on this survey?
   Yes
   No

Free-Response Questions:
What do you think are the strengths of this instructor’s teaching?
What suggestions, if any, do you have to further improve the instructor’s teaching?
If you like, please use this space to elaborate on your responses to the multiple choice
questions above.
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 1-15 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
1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

6: helped me integrate the lecture concepts with the class/activity.
7: increased my understanding of the subject.
8: stimulated my interest in the subject.
9: Overall, this instructor’s teaching was effective.

Please answer the following informational items:

10. How often did you attend class?
   Almost always
   Often
   Occasionally
   Seldom
   Almost never

11. What is your current estimate of your expected overall grade in this course?
   A
   B
12. You are a:
   - Freshman
   - Sophomore
   - Junior
   - Senior
   - Graduate Student
   - Credential Only
   - Other (e.g. Open University)

13: During a typical week in this course, how many hours did you spend outside of class on course-related activities (such as reading, completing assignments, studying, service learning, field work, group work, etc.)?

   (NOTE: This will be programmed to be answered as a number field, and the course units will be added to the report, allowing users to easily divide the answer by the actual course units to generate Carnegie Units.)

14. Did any other student attempt to influence your answers on this survey?
   - Yes
   - No

15. Did your instructor attempt to influence your answers on this survey?
   - Yes
   - No

Free-Response Questions:

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

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

If you like, please use this space to elaborate on your responses to the multiple choice questions above.
Policy Recommendation
Probation and Disqualification

Whereas University Policy S10-6 has already been amended twice (S11-1 and S15-5) and now would require many further amendments to become consistent with policies such as F12-7 (Former Students Returning), Academic Disqualification and Reinstatement Review Committee (ADRRC) Guidelines on Probation and Disqualification in the Major, and changes in ADRRC implementation of reinstatement criteria; therefore be it

Resolved That University Policies S10-6, S11-1, and S15-5 be rescinded and replaced by the following policy.
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I. Undergraduate Students

Per Sections 41300 and 41300.1 Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, undergraduate students studying for a baccalaureate degree are expected to maintain a grade point average (GPA) of 2.0 or better in their academic work at SJSU in order to be classified as being in good academic standing. In determining a student’s eligibility to remain enrolled at SJSU, both quality of performance and progress toward the degree or other program objective are weighed. Quality of performance is determined by the GPA in all letter-graded courses. Other factors, such as the total number of units taken, the number of courses repeated, or the GPA in the major may be considered in determining progress toward degree or other degree program objectives.

A. University Academic Probation and Continued Probation

Undergraduate students will be placed on academic probation if at any time (following a Fall, Winter, Spring, or Summer term) their SJSU cumulative GPA falls below 2.0. The probation status is shown on the transcript.

Undergraduate students on probation will remain on continued probation when the following term GPA is 2.0 or better, while the SJSU cumulative GPA remains below 2.0. The continued probation status is shown on the transcript and is treated like probation in terms of academic standing.

Freshmen on academic probation are allowed a second consecutive semester of probation (known as continued probation) if the SJSU cumulative GPA is in the range 1.50 to 1.99.

The Registrar will notify students who are placed on probation of that fact when term grades are posted. The notification will include a referral of the students to their advisors for consultation. Undergraduate students on academic probation may have restrictions placed on their total unit load.

Undergraduate students on probation or continued probation will have holds placed on their records and will not be allowed to participate in further registration activity until they have conferred with their major advisors to design a study plan to raise their GPA to at least 2.0 in the most expeditious manner. The registration hold will continue until the student achieves clearance from probation.

Undergraduate students will remain on probation or continued probation until they are removed from probation or are disqualified. They are removed from probation and returned to good standing when the SJSU cumulative GPA is raised to at least 2.0 (following a Fall, Winter, Spring, or Summer term).

B. University Academic Disqualification

Undergraduate students on probation or continued probation will be academically disqualified when the term GPA for a Fall or Spring semester is below 2.0. The disqualified status is shown on the transcript.
C. Reinstatement following Academic Disqualification

Undergraduate students disqualified from the university can petition to be reinstated. Reinstatement is a process separate from readmission. Readmission requires reapplication via CSU Mentor. University Policy F12-7 provides a mechanism to give Former Students Returning (FSRs) priority for readmission as upper-division transfers. This is a separate petition process with its own deadlines distinct from those pertaining to CSU Mentor application deadlines and to reinstatement petition deadlines.

The reinstatement petition and FSR petition processes include department and college-level approvals. Reinstatement on probation requires, additionally, the signature of the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies. For undergraduates, reinstatement into the university does not guarantee reinstatement into the previous major. Undergraduate students who do not obtain department or college-level approval for reinstatement into their previous majors may petition for reinstatement into new majors or into an undeclared status. The ADRRC is charged with establishing and evaluating the guidelines for reinstatement.

There are four categories available for petitioning for reinstatement as an undergraduate student:

1. **Raising the SJSU Cumulative GPA to 2.0 or Better.** Generally, the SJSU cumulative GPA is raised through SJSU Open University coursework, although retroactive (after the last day of classes) actions by students, such as completion of Incomplete (“I”) grades or course drops, can also raise the SJSU cumulative GPA.

2. **Extenuating Circumstances.** Reinstatements in this category will be granted only for serious and compelling circumstances that were clearly beyond a student’s control and are clearly documented in the petition. The criteria for approval under this category are similar to those required for a retroactive (course) drop or retroactive (semester) withdrawal. Sometimes the approval of such retroactive petitions will raise the SJSU cumulative GPA to 2.0 or better (good academic standing), thus shifting to a Category 1 approval. However, even in such cases, rescinding academic standing already posted to the record is very rarely approved.

3. **Special Consideration.** This category is reserved for students whose petitions cannot be accommodated within the other categories. Typically, such students have spent substantial time (five years or more) away from SJSU since their disqualification and can demonstrate that their life experiences have prepared them for a successful return to school. Students disqualified while in the lower division may be reinstated and readmitted in fewer than five years. Generally, students must be eligible for readmission on probation prior to approval under this category. Multiple reinstatements under this category are rarely granted.

4. **Petitioned Grade Change.** This category is reserved for changes in grade approved under Section III (Grade Appeal) and Section IV (Change of Grade) of University Policy S09-7. If a timely grade change results in an increase in the term GPA or in the SJSU cumulative GPA to 2.0 or better, the student may qualify, not only for reinstatement under this category, but also for the rescinding of the academic standing of probation or
Disqualification (meaning that the academic standing is removed from the transcript).

The rationale for the rescinding of academic standing is that the instructor and not the student made the error that led to an incorrect posting of academic standing. Generally, the grade change must be made by the Drop Deadline of the following Fall or Spring semester. Further extension of this deadline will be considered only when there is documentation of the student’s attempt(s) to contact the instructor and/or the department chair, and the late submission of the change of grade form is clearly beyond the student’s control, as described in University Policy S09-7.

Reinstatement of undergraduates following a second disqualification must generally be done under Category 1.

D. Administrative Academic Probation and Disqualification

Per Sections 41300.1 Title 5, “An undergraduate… student may also be placed on probation or may be disqualified by appropriate campus authorities for unsatisfactory scholastic progress regardless of cumulative grade point average or progress points. Such actions shall be limited to those arising from repeated withdrawal, failure to progress toward an educational objective and noncompliance with an academic requirement…”

Limitations. As with academic probation and disqualification, administrative academic probation must precede administrative academic disqualification in all but the most exceptional circumstances (see below). In most cases, a direct reassignment from good standing in the major to disqualification from the major is prohibited. In other words, at least one semester of probation in the major is required prior to disqualification from the major. The underlying philosophical premise is that students should be placed on notice prior to disqualification.

Transcript Notation. Both administrative academic probation and administrative academic disqualification status may be shown on the transcript, but rarely will this happen. Negative service indicators attached to a student’s electronic record can effectively manage everything from mandatory advising to restricted enrollment, and should be the routine mechanism for managing administrative academic probation and administrative academic disqualification. If a transcript notation is warranted, then the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies makes final decisions about rescinding administrative academic transcript notations. These decisions may be appealed to the ADRRC (see Section III of this policy).

Academic Progress in the Major1. Most instances of administrative academic probation and disqualification result from probation and disqualification in the major.2

---

1 Definition of Major. For the purposes of this policy, “major” means a unique degree program. Specifically, each individual concentration is a degree program. For example, there is only one individual type of baccalaureate degree in the College of Business, the B.S., Business Administration. There are, however, multiple concentrations, many of which have different criteria related to probation and disqualification, change of major, and (re)admission to the major. Each of these concentrations is treated as its own major.

2 Supporting Student Success. Although it may seem harsh to disqualify students from the majors of their choice, in many instances, students will be well served by such departmental policies. For example, there are many students who barely progress through their major degree programs, only to discover when they are high
Despite maintaining a SJSU cumulative GPA of 2.0 or better, an undergraduate student's academic performance in the major may fall below the minimum standards for that major. In these cases, while the student remains in overall good standing with the university, he or she is subject to administrative-academic probation and disqualification from the major. Each college, school, department, and program (hereafter referred to as "program") may employ program-specific criteria for determining a policy of probation in, disqualification from, and reinstatement into the major. These criteria must be reviewed and approved by the ADRRC.

Notification. Undergraduate programs must ensure that all students within the concerned majors are advised of these program-level criteria and the consequences of being placed on Administrative Academic Probation or Disqualification. At a minimum, criteria in addition to or differing from university regulations must be posted on departmental and/or program websites and any other program documents, such as student handbooks.

Probation in the Major and Disqualification from the Major.

1. Probation in the Major

Undergraduate students may be placed on probation in the major when their cumulative GPA in the major falls below 2.0. The GPA in the major is generally defined by the section of the catalog labeled Requirements of the Major, but for the purposes of this policy major GPA may be specified to include courses in Preparation for the Major. SJSU and non-SJSU courses should be considered. Departments and schools must notify students in writing of (new) probation in the major or disqualification from the major status no later than two weeks following the posting of university academic standing. They must also be provided with the conditions for release from administrative academic probation and the circumstances that would lead to administrative academic disqualification should probation not be cleared. There should be a mechanism to permit return to good standing from probation. Undergraduate students must be advised to meet with an advisor in the major to design a study plan to raise their GPA in the major to 2.0 in the next semester of enrollment.

2. Disqualification from the Major

If undergraduate students on probation in the major fail to achieve a minimum term GPA of 2.0 in the major during a subsequent Fall or Spring semester, they may be disqualified from the major. Departments and/or colleges must notify the Registrar's unit seniors that they are unable to complete key upper-division or capstone courses, or they have major GPAs well below 2.0 even though their SJSU GPAs are above 2.0. It is better for students to discover early in their degree work that either they need to demonstrate improvement in courses leading to the major or they should find another major more suited to their talents and interests. All policies developed to be consistent with this policy will still require advising and student support structures (tutoring, counseling, etc.) to function as intended. Probation and disqualification in the major, at its best, can provide a mechanism to compel struggling students to recognize areas for improvement, successfully negotiate hurdles, and get back on track. Alternatively, such policies can help students realize early in their academic careers that they should be exploring other majors and possible careers prior to spending a great deal of time and money pursuing a major that is a poor fit. In summary, well-designed and well-implemented policies for probation and disqualification in the major will be beneficial as an early warning system for students and enhance retention and graduation efforts more generally.
Students disqualified under this policy will be notified by the program that they are no longer eligible to continue in the major and that their major will be changed to undeclared unless another major for which they are qualified is selected. Notification will include a referral of the students to their advisors for consultation.

3. Guidelines and Criteria for Programmatic Probation and Disqualification

Maximum Course Grade or GPA Requirements. Programs may not require individual course grades to be higher than “C” for undergraduates. At the most, a department may require that each and every course required for the degree program be passed at this standard. The corollary is that the maximum GPA that can be required for any set of courses cannot be higher than 2.0 for undergraduates. Related to these general guidelines are the following stipulations:

a. Admission requirements and degree requirements are different. Admission to an impacted degree program may include supplemental criteria such as a GPA greater than the 2.0 threshold. However, once a student is admitted to a major, the degree requirements must be limited to “C or better” for undergraduates (Title 5).

b. Following a disqualification from the major, reinstatement to the major may include course grades or GPA requirements higher than the standard thresholds. In effect, students seeking such reinstatements are being admitted to the major again and may be held to higher standards than are required to complete a degree. This is especially appropriate for impacted majors that already apply supplemental criteria for admission of new students to the major.

Restrictions on Course or Unit Load Per Semester. Programs may restrict a student to two attempts of any course offered by the program. The basic guideline is that the university rules for repeating courses should be followed unless the program chooses to be more lenient than the university. These parameters may be set as a minimum or maximum. For example, cohort programs may require that a minimum number of courses/units be taken each semester in order to best utilize resources or to ensure that the program is completed while student knowledge is still current. Alternatively, setting a maximum number of units may make sense for students on probation in the major. Special situations include the following:

a. Approved course drops or semester withdrawals (W grades) are considered to be without prejudice and should not be counted as an attempt at a course if the program restricts the number of attempts of a course (per University Policy S09-7).

b. If grade forgiveness is allowed (undergraduates only), then the repeat grade must be considered without prejudice (as implicit in University Policy F08-2).

c. If grade forgiveness is not possible when a course is attempted multiple times, the university will use grade averaging in computing the SJSU GPA (per
University Policy F08-2). A program may also do this or may consider the final attempt at the course or the highest grade in the course for the purposes of the major GPA or to satisfy any requirements prior to completion of the major.

d. If the course in question is offered by another department, the program may consider only the first two attempts in determining probation or disqualification status. Clearly, the major department cannot restrict the number of times a student enrolls in a course offered by another department, but it is permitted, for instance, to ignore the grade from a third attempt to pass a class with a C or better.

Exceptions. Exceptions to the rule that administrative academic disqualification must be preceded by a probationary period may be made in the following cases:

a. In clinical courses, laboratory courses, or other types of programmatic requirements, there may be such serious concerns about the safety or well-being of the student or other students, clients, patients, etc., that repetition of the course is not reasonable. For such courses or programmatic experiences, departments may establish “no repeat” policies, i.e., a course may not be repeated if not passed on the first attempt. The course catalog description, course syllabus, and programmatic information must all clearly provide this information. In clinical or lab settings in which safety or well-being are severely compromised, an instructor may disenroll a student from the course, which may lead to disqualification from the major. In general, the immediate move from good standing to disqualification (without a term of probation in between) should be associated with the inability to satisfy a specific course requirement on the first and only allowable attempt, not with a less specific programmatic requirement.

b. There may even be time limits or unit limits established to satisfy certain conditions, which, if not met, may lead to disqualification from the major degree program without an intervening term on probation. Cohort programs must provide in their policies a reasonable accommodation for students who must stop out for legitimate reasons.

Programs may consider university probation or disqualification as a factor in determining probation in or disqualification from the major.

4. Reinstatement to the Major

Programs employing a policy for disqualification from the major may have a procedure or set of conditions for reinstatement of those students into the major. Conditions for reinstatement should be clearly communicated to students at the time they are disqualified. If it is not possible to be reinstated after a programmatic disqualification, which is a programmatic option, then that too must be communicated. Conditions for reinstatement from administrative academic disqualification, if it is to be allowed, should be stringent enough that students return to the major in good standing as opposed to being reinstated on probation.
A critical step in achieving reinstatement to the major following disqualification from the major is consultation by students with their advisors to design a study plan that addresses scholastic deficiencies and demonstrates that they are ready to resume rigorous academic work.

5. Petitions

In cases of error or extenuating circumstances, upon receiving notice of administrative academic probation or disqualification, students may petition to an appropriate faculty committee at the program level or to the department chair/school director to appeal such action. In the case of a negative decision in response to the petition, students may appeal to the ADRRC, the process for which is described in Section III below. After review of the petition, the ADRRC will make a recommendation to the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies to confirm or rescind the action.

II. Graduate, Post-baccalaureate, and Credential Students

A1. University Academic Probation and Continued Probation

Graduate and post-baccalaureate teaching credential candidates will be placed on academic probation if at any time (following a Fall, Winter, Spring, or Summer term) their SJSU cumulative GPA falls below 3.0. The probation status is shown on the transcript.

Graduate students and credential candidates on probation will remain on continued probation when the following term GPA is 3.0 or better, while the SJSU cumulative GPA remains below 3.0. The continued probation status is shown on the transcript and is treated like probation in terms of academic standing.

Distinction between SJSU Cum GPA (as shown on the transcript) and GPA for the degree program (as shown on the candidacy form). All upper-division (100 level) and graduate-level (200 level) courses, including SJSU Open University courses taken as a post-baccalaureate, will be used in the calculation of SJSU cumulative GPA. Courses from other institutions and courses from the SJSU undergraduate career will not be counted in the graduate SJSU cumulative GPA. In addition, the GPA among all of the courses that appear on the candidacy form (count toward the degree) must also be a minimum of 3.0 for degree conferral. SJSU courses taken at the lower-division level (numbered below 100) will be shown on the student transcript but cannot be used to satisfy graduate degree requirements and will not be included in the graduate student GPA calculations.

The Registrar will notify students who are placed on academic probation of that fact when term grades are posted. The students will also be advised of conditions required for return to good standing, the consequences of not maintaining a term GPA of 3.0, and the necessity of conferring with their graduate advisor.

Graduate and credential candidates will remain on probation or continued probation until they are removed from probation or are disqualified. They are removed from probation and returned to good standing when the SJSU cumulative GPA is raised to at least 3.0 (following a Fall, Winter, Spring, or Summer term).
A2. Completion of all Degree or Credential Requirements While on Probation

Should the SJSU cumulative GPA fall below 3.0 at the same time that the candidacy GPA is above 3.0, the student’s academic standing will reflect the former only. In this unusual circumstance, the student or program must make the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies aware of this discrepancy. He or she will rescind the academic standing by contacting the Registrar, and the student record will be altered to “good standing.” Enrollment in at least one letter-graded course is required of graduate students in each Fall and Spring semester that they are on academic probation.

If a graduate student does not complete the graduate degree program with the minimum 3.0 GPA in the candidacy coursework (thus in all degree requirements), his or her major department may terminate the candidacy or permit completing additional courses in an attempt to raise the GPA in the program to the 3.0 threshold. When the student’s major department recommends the latter, 30% of the total units in the major may be added to the candidacy form, but this total is for the entire duration of the graduate career. The additional courses can be ones already taken or courses to substitute for elective courses on the candidacy form. Note that the original grade, even with a substitution, cannot be eliminated but instead is counted in GPA calculations along with the new grade. Any course with a grade less than a "B" may be repeated at the graduate level, but no more than 9 units in the graduate career, no matter the number of units required in the degree program, can be repeated per University Policy F08-2.

Failure to raise the candidacy and SJSU cumulative GPA to 3.0 after completing these additional courses(s) will result in a termination of the student’s candidacy and an inability to earn the graduate degree.

Credential candidates who fail to achieve a 3.0 GPA upon completion of the credential program will be precluded by the department from attempting additional coursework and therefore not be recommended for an award of a credential by the State of California.

B. University Academic Disqualification

Graduate students on probation or continued probation will be academically disqualified when the term GPA for a Fall, Winter, Spring, or Summer term is below 3.0. The disqualified status is shown on the transcript.

C. Reinstatement following Academic Disqualification

Graduate students disqualified from the university for the first time can petition to be reinstated, unless otherwise disallowed by an accrediting body or other governing agency. Reinstatement is a process separate from readmission. Students must file an application for readmission with CSU Mentor to register for classes following reinstatement. Application for readmission can be done during the semester in which the program of study is underway or in which the reinstatement petition is being considered.

A graduate student may petition for reinstatement on the basis of any of the following five categories:
1. Raising the SJSU Cumulative GPA to 3.0 or Better. The SJSU cumulative GPA can be raised through SJSU Open University coursework as part of a Program of Study (see below), although retroactive (after the last day of classes) actions by students, such as completion of Incomplete (“I”) grades or course drops, can also raise the SJSU cumulative GPA.

2. Extenuating Circumstances. Reinstatements in this category will be granted only for serious and compelling circumstances that were clearly beyond a student’s control and are clearly documented in the petition. The criteria for approval under this category are similar to those required for a retroactive (course) drop or retroactive (semester) withdrawal. Sometimes the approval of such retroactive petitions will raise the SJSU cumulative GPA to 3.0 or better (good academic standing), thus shifting to a Category 1 approval. However, even in such cases, rescinding academic standing already posted to the record is very rarely approved.

3. Special Consideration. This category is reserved for students whose petitions cannot be accommodated within the other categories. Such students will have spent substantial time (five years or more) away from SJSU since their disqualification and can demonstrate that their life experiences have prepared them for a successful return to school. Often this request is accompanied by a change of major from that in which the disqualification occurred.

Because this category of reinstatement exists to give students a fresh start on their degree pursuit, past grades that led to the previous disqualification should not hinder a student’s progress through the newly begun degree program. Circumstances could exist in which the original scholastic performance was so poor that, even with excellent progress through the new degree program, the GPA could not be returned to a 3.0 level. Therefore, the previous grades should not be counted against the student. This can be effected by means of a Disregard of All Previous Graduate Coursework Petition. The corollary to this benefit is that none of the disregarded coursework may be used in the new degree program; however, satisfaction of the graduate-level Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) would carry over to the new program. By the same token, no courses from any source may be transferred into the new degree program.

4. Petitioned Grade Change. This category is reserved for changes in grade approved under Section III (Grade Appeal) and Section IV (Change of Grade) of University Policy S09-7. If a timely grade change results in an increase in the term GPA or in the SJSU cumulative GPA to 3.0 or better, the student may qualify not only for reinstatement under this category, but also for the rescinding of the academic standing of probation or disqualification (meaning that the academic standing is removed from the transcript). The rationale for the rescinding of academic standing is that the instructor and not the student made the error that led to an incorrect posting of academic standing. Generally, grade change must be made by the Drop Deadline of the following Fall or Spring semester. Further extension of this deadline will be considered only when there is documentation of the student’s attempt(s) to contact the instructor and/or the department chair, and the late submission of the change of grade form is clearly beyond the student’s control, as described in University Policy S09-7.
5. Program of Study. A graduate student must confer with his or her graduate advisor to develop a schedule of classes appropriate to the student’s major. The courses must consist of a minimum of 6 units per term, and all must be taken in a single term. They must be letter graded, upper division (100-level), and taken through the SJSU Open University or SJSU’s Extended Studies winter or summer session. The 100-level courses may or may not be part of the graduation requirements for the student’s degree program. The advisor may require more than 6 units of coursework but no more than 9 units. Graduate (200-level) courses are not permitted in the program of study, and disqualified students cannot enroll in 200-level courses. Courses taken prior to approval of the program of study via submission of the Graduate Petition for Reinstatement will not be accepted. Also precluded from the program of study are courses taken at another university, 300-level, 400-level, or 500-level courses, and lower-division courses. If the student plans to pursue a different degree program upon readmission to the university, the program of study must be applicable to the new major, be developed in conjunction with the graduate advisor of the new major, and demonstrate the student’s capacity to complete the new graduate degree requirements. If a course on an approved program of study becomes unavailable, another reinstatement petition must be submitted and approved immediately after enrollment in a substitute course. Once the program of study has been completed successfully with a minimum GPA of 3.3 (“B+”) and no grades lower than B, he or she will be reinstated and, after reapplication to the university, readmitted to the university and the department. Should the student fail to achieve the 3.3 minimum GPA, additional programs of study are permissible with entirely new classes and consent of the graduate advisor of the incoming major.

Reinstatement is not allowed for a second disqualification. Unless extenuating circumstances can be cited that result in rescinding the second disqualification, a Graduate Petition for Reinstatement will not be accepted from students who have been disqualified more than once.

Graduate students reinstated following university disqualification normally return on probation. Subsequently, they must achieve an SJSU term GPA of 3.0 or better each semester following readmission until their cumulative SJSU GPA is 3.0 or better. Failure to attain a minimum SJSU term GPA of 3.0 will result in a second and final disqualification.

D. Administrative Academic Probation and Disqualification

Per Sections 41300.1 Title 5, “... [A] graduate student may also be placed on probation or may be disqualified by appropriate campus authorities for unsatisfactory scholastic progress regardless of cumulative grade point average or progress points. Such actions shall be limited to those arising from repeated withdrawal, failure to progress toward an educational objective and noncompliance with an academic requirement...”

Limitations. As with academic probation and disqualification, administrative academic probation must precede administrative academic disqualification in all but the most exceptional circumstances (see below). In most cases, a direct reassignment from good standing in the major to disqualification from the major is prohibited. In other words, at least one semester of probation in the major is required prior to disqualification from the major. The underlying philosophical premise is that students should be placed on notice...
prior to disqualification. For example, a substandard grade in one course could not result in disqualification; rather, the student would be put on administrative academic probation and afforded the opportunity to repeat that class. Passage of the repeated course with the required grade would result in the return of the student to good standing. Programs can limit the number of semesters on probation in the student career to as few as one.

Transcript Notation. For graduate students, only administrative academic disqualification (not administrative academic probation) status should be noted on the transcript.

**Academic Progress in the Major**. Most instances of administrative academic probation and disqualification result from probation in and disqualification from the major.

Despite maintaining a SJSU cumulative GPA of 3.0 or better, a graduate student’s academic performance in the major may fall below the minimum standards established in that major. In these cases, while students remain in overall good standing with the university, they are subject to probation in and disqualification from the graduate major. As with undergraduate programs, each college, school, department, and program (hereafter referred to as “program”) may employ a policy of probation in, disqualification from, and reinstatement into the graduate major. The criteria must be reviewed and approved by the ADRRC.

Notification. Graduate programs must ensure that all students within the concerned majors are advised of these program-level criteria. At a minimum, criteria in addition to or differing from university regulations must be posted on departmental and/or program websites and any other program documents, such as student handbooks.

**Probation in the Major and Disqualification from the Major**

1. **Probation in the Major**

Departments and schools must notify students in writing of (new) probation in the major or disqualification from the major status no later than two weeks following the posting of university academic standing. They must also be provided with the conditions for release from administrative academic probation and the circumstances that would lead to administrative academic disqualification should probation not be cleared. There should be a mechanism to permit return to good standing from probation. Graduate

---

3 **Definition of Major**. For the purposes of this policy, "major" means a unique degree program. Specifically, each individual concentration is a degree program. For example, there is only one type of M.S. degree offered by the Department of Biological Sciences, that being the M.S., Biological Sciences. There are, however, multiple concentrations which may have different criteria related to probation and disqualification. Each of these concentrations is treated as its own major.

4 **Supporting Student Success**. These guidelines protect the integrity of the university and of the discipline, which is imperative for those students remaining in the degree program, the employers who hire our graduates, and the faculty who provide oversight of the academic program. A high level of scholarship and of ethical and operational behavior is needed at the graduate level, and individual programs are given some leeway in developing standards for their programs that meet the needs of the community they are serving as well as the field of study in which the students will be claiming expertise. As with undergraduates, probation in the graduate program alerts students that their performance is less than satisfactory. The limited duration and resource-intensive nature of graduate programs and the expectation for a consistently high level academic performance from graduate students may require additional policies regarding satisfactory academic progress.
students must be advised to meet with an advisor in the major to design a study plan to return to good standing in the major. When administrative-academic probation occurs, students will be notified of the reasons in writing by the program with copies delivered to the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies and the Registrar.

2. Disqualification from the Major

When administrative academic disqualification occurs, students will be notified of the reasons in writing by the program with copies delivered to the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies and the Registrar. Disqualification from the major will be determined after every Fall, Winter, Spring, or Summer term.

The reinstatement process includes department and college-level approval. Reinstatement into the university does not guarantee reinstatement into the previous major. Graduate students who do not obtain department or college-level approval for reinstatement into their previous majors may petition for reinstatement into new majors. Unlike undergraduates, graduate students cannot be “undeclared” or “programless,” i.e., they must obtain approval from some program to be reinstated. Reinstated students cannot be denied admission on the basis of their lack of good standing. The ADRRC is charged with establishing and evaluating the guidelines for reinstatement.

3. Guidelines and Criteria for Programmatic Probation and Disqualification

Qualifying or Comprehensive Exams. In programs in which qualifying or comprehensive exams must be passed, policies governing exam procedure, for example, with regard to the number of times the exams may be attempted, must be formulated and publicized by the programs.

Maximum Course Grade or GPA Requirements. Programs may not require individual course grades to be higher than “B” for graduate students. At the most, a department may require that each course required for the degree program be passed at this standard. The corollary is that the maximum GPA that can be required for any set of courses cannot be higher than 3.0 for graduate students.

Admission requirements and degree requirements are different. Admission to a graduate degree program may include supplemental criteria such as a GPA greater than the 3.0 threshold. However, once a student is admitted to a major, the degree requirements must be limited to “B or better” for graduate students (Title 5).

Examples. Among the standards that a program might make mandatory is the achievement of grades of “B” in every class or in particular classes with a stipulated number of repetitions permitted. Similarly, an acceptable standard would be to require a “CR” in field, student teaching, or internship courses with a stipulated number of “NC” grades allowed for repetition. In addition, graduate students are expected to make reasonable progress through their degree program. One cannot, for example, have been admitted to one program but take no courses in it while taking courses in a second program. Usually graduate students must successfully form a master’s or doctoral committee. While the program should make every attempt to aid a student in forming a committee, the inability to do so would be grounds for dismissal from the program. Repeated failure to complete a project or thesis research proposal would constitute reasonable justification for disqualifying a student.
Restrictions on Course or Unit Load Per Semester. Programs may restrict a student to two attempts of any course offered by the program. The basic guideline is that the university rules for repeating courses should be followed unless the program chooses to be more lenient than the university. These sorts of criteria may be set as a minimum or maximum. For example, cohort programs may require that a minimum number of courses/units be taken each semester in order to best utilize resources or to ensure that the program is completed while student knowledge is still current. Alternatively, setting a maximum number of units may make sense for students on probation.

a. Approved course or semester withdrawals (W grades on the unofficial transcript) are considered to be without prejudice and should not be counted as an attempt at a course if the major program restricts the number of attempts for a course (per University Policy S09-7).

b. For graduate students, the university will use grade averaging in computing the SJSU GPA (per University Policy F08-2).

c. If the course in question is offered by another department, the program may consider only the first two attempts in determining probation or disqualification status. Clearly, the major department cannot restrict the number of times a student enrolls in a course offered by another department, but it is permitted, for instance, to ignore the grade from a third attempt to pass a class with a B or better.

A department may consider university probation or disqualification as a factor in determining probation or disqualification in the major.

Exceptions. Exceptions to the rule that administrative academic disqualification must be preceded by a probationary period may be made in the following cases:

a. In clinical courses, laboratory courses, student teaching assignments, or other types of programmatic requirements, there may be such serious concerns about the safety or well-being of the student, other students, clients, patients, and so forth, that repetition of the courses is not reasonable. For such courses or programmatic experiences, departments may establish “no repeat” policies, i.e., a course may not be repeated if not passed on the first attempt. However, the “no repeat” option would not have to be in place to disqualify a student from a course. In clinical or lab settings in which safety or well-being are severely compromised, an instructor may disenroll a student from the course, which may lead to disqualification from the major. In general, the immediate move from good standing to disqualification (without a term of probation in between) should be associated with the inability to satisfy a specific course requirement on the first and only allowable attempt, not with a less specific programmatic requirement. Unless clearly falling into the category described here, courses by which immediate disqualification can be imposed must be approved in advance by the ADRRC.

b. A program can disqualify a student without a probationary period for behavior that fails to comply with professional standards of conduct appropriate to the field
of study. This conduct could occur in or out of class. It must be highly egregious for the disqualification action to be taken. Examples include threatening behavior, repeated disruptions of classes that interfere with the educational opportunities of other students, and repeated acts of professorial disrespect, badgering, rudeness, interruptions, and verbal or written abuse. The disqualification action is still appealable so it is advisable that the program consult with Graduate Studies before proceeding.

c. Conditional acceptance to a program is, in effect, acceptance under probation in the major. Typically, a specified set of courses or requirements must be passed prior to attaining good standing in the program. There may be time limits or unit limits established to satisfy the conditions, which, if not met, may lead to disqualification from the major degree program without an intervening term on explicit probation. Cohort programs must provide in their policies a reasonable accommodation for students who must stop out for legitimate reasons.

d. Teaching credential students do not receive a degree from SJSU and are subject to the regulations of the state legislature and licensing agency. Credential courses that exceed the seven-year limit cannot be revalidated. As with graduate master’s degree programs in the CSU, the overall GPA and candidacy GPA must be at 3.0 or above for completion. In the case of credentials, a recommendation from the university to the state credentialing agency would be withheld without the requisite GPA. Students who fail to achieve this level of scholastic success or who are deemed dispositionally unsuitable for a teaching career can be precluded by the program from repeating courses or taking other courses to raise the GPA and so are effectively permanently terminated from the university without the credential recommendation.

4. Reinstatement after Administrative Academic Disqualification

Without compelling reasons, administratively academically disqualified graduate students may not be reinstated to the major from which they were dismissed. Should a graduate student may find a new program willing to reinstate, transfer into that program will require program approval via a Graduate Change-of-Major application process without reapplication to the university, if permitted by the new department or school. However, should more than one semester pass without reinstatement, reapplication would be necessary. The student may not take courses in matriculated status before approval is secured. Disqualified students may not take graduate-level courses through Open University.

III. Appeal of Administrative Academic Probation or Disqualification

Upon receiving notice of administrative academic probation or disqualification, students should first consult with their advisors, then, if necessary, file a written appeal first with a program-level faculty committee, then with the appropriate ADRRC appeals officer, the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies or the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies. In either case, the appeal should be based on (a) advising or administrative errors, (b) actions by the department or school that were contrary to university policy, or (c) extenuating circumstances.
A critical first step in the appeal process is consultation by a student with an advisor representing the major in which reinstatement is sought. A report of the consultation and the advisor’s recommendation should be forwarded to the ADRRC.

In cases of extenuation, a student must present evidence of extenuating circumstances beyond the his or her control that disrupted previously satisfactory academic performance, and documentation that such conditions will no longer affect academic performance.

Establishing and evaluating the procedure for the appeal process is the charge of the ADRRC. The following operating rules have been put into effect for appeals of probation and disqualification administrative academic probation and disqualification.

A. Student Appeal Filing. Students must submit a written appeal to the appropriate appeals officer of the ADRRC, the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies or of Graduate Studies, within one calendar month after the start of the succeeding Fall or Spring semester. The student name, ID, contact information (email and phone), unofficial transcript, and a personal statement must be included.

B. Validity of Appeal. The appeals officer is afforded the authority to determine whether adequate grounds exist for a formal hearing. He or she will conduct a review to determine whether the student has been treated according to the approved departmental/school policy (that is, whether policy has been faithfully executed by the department or school), whether the student was adequately and reasonably informed of the policy, whether an adequate and persuasive written record of actionable student conduct was constructed, and whether the student’s conduct and/or course grade makes him or her subject to the consequences of the policy. If the case cannot be settled by consultation with department/school personnel and if the complaint is based on violation of an approved departmental policy that the ADRRC deems to be confusing, unclear, or unfair, then the ADRRC will form a subcommittee and schedule a hearing, normally within 45 working days of receiving the student appeal.

C. Subcommittee Structure. The subcommittee will be chaired by the Associate Dean of either Undergraduate Studies or Graduate Studies, based on the student career, and he or she will also be a voting member. The subcommittee will further consist of one college Associate Dean as a second voting member, chosen on a rotating basis. The Associate Dean of the college in which the student’s program resides will also serve but as a nonvoting member. The third voting member, again on a rotating basis, will be an ADRRC member who is not an Associate Dean.

D. Hearing Rules. Documentation can be submitted by either party but must be disclosed to the other party. Testifying individuals may include the student complainant, the department chair/school director or a designee, and other individuals requested by either party if deemed relevant by the subcommittee chair. Nontestifying individuals present for emotional support or legal representation may not speak unless directly addressed.

E. Decisions. Unless additional testimony or significant investigation is needed following an appeal hearing, the ADRRC subcommittee will notify the student of its decision in writing within 10 working days. Of the three voting members of the subcommittee, a majority is needed for a decision.
Students have the right to consult with the University Ombudsperson at any point during this process.

Approved: April 18, 2016
Vote: 14-0-1
Absent: Gay, Rees
Financial Impact: None
Workload Impact: None
Financial Impact: Not significant
Policy Recommendation
Departmental Voting Rights

Legislative History: Rescinds F66-6 related to voting privileges for faculty on leave. Rescinds F02-4 and S98-2 both of which pertained to departmental voting rights. F02-4 arose from deliberations about whether and how temporary faculty may participate in nomination and selection of department chairs, and a concern that the previous policy (S98-2) appeared to exclude temporary faculty from such participation.

Whereas, The voting processes associated with nominations, selection and recall of department chairs; and decisions relating to curricula, policies and other business of academic departments requires clarification; and

Whereas, Participation of all faculty in departmental decision-making are critical for democratic participation in shared governance; and

Whereas, Meaningful engagement of departmental faculty is an essential component of assuring the integrity of departmental business and commitments to students; and

Whereas, The current CSU/CFA Agreement provides this guidance regarding department chair assignments:

20.30 Department chairs shall normally be selected from the list of tenured or probationary faculty employees recommended by the department for the assignment.
20.31 Such department chairs shall perform duties and carry out responsibilities assigned by the President.
20.32 Such department chairs shall be appointed by the President and shall serve at the pleasure of the President.

now, therefore, be it

Resolved: That F02-4, S98-2, and F66-6 be replaced by this policy; and be it further

Resolved: That the administration, in consultation with the Senate, investigate options and subsequently acquire an appropriate resource to facilitate online voting at all levels (department, college, university); and be it further
Resolved: That the attached policy be implemented following approval by the President.

Rationale: A number of voting related issues have arisen over the intervening 14 years following implementation of F02-4. These include consideration of the various procedures employed in academic departments for such issues as curricular changes, policies, determinations of what issues require formal or informal votes by faculty, implications of appointment fractions, and the opportunities as well as the limitations of technological resources. This proposed update to the departmental voting rights policy seeks to provide greater clarity and guidance on such issues. In addition, as revisions were made, voting guidelines found in both the Senate constitution (Article II section 3c) and bylaws (1.7) were taken into consideration.

Approved: 4/18/16

Vote: 9-0-0

Present: Laker, Shifflett, Beyersdorf, Becker, Gleixner, Curry, Grosvenor, Romero, Mathur

Absent:

Financial Impact: None expected.

Workload Impact: None expected.
The ideals of higher education are rooted in principles of democracy and shared governance. Our first principle is to ensure that each faculty member be empowered to participate in decision-making processes. This policy revision is intended to facilitate this aim. Voting rights described in this policy exclude all personnel matters, but include all other departmental matters. Nomination and election of Department Chairs is covered under S14-8.

1. Definition. Departmental voting rights are the rights granted to faculty to have a voice, through voting, on matters related to the department(s) they are formally affiliated with, including but not limited to governance, curriculum, operations, and leadership.

2. Department of permanent assignment.

For purposes of this policy, "department of permanent assignment" means the academic department or equivalent unit officially designated for a faculty member at the time of appointment, or the department to which he/she has been subsequently officially reassigned on a permanent basis.

3. Regular Faculty Departmental Voting Rights

Regular faculty have departmental voting rights in proportion to their permanent assignment in a department or departments.

3.1 Voting rights of regular faculty are terminated by suspension, complete retirement, or other termination of employment.

3.2 Voting rights of regular faculty are suspended for any semester in which the individual holds a full-time administrative or other non-faculty position in the university.

3.3 Leaves. Unless otherwise determined by department policy, regular faculty who would be entitled to participate in departmental proceedings if not on leave, may participate and vote while on leave, provided they take part in the deliberations preceding the vote.

3.4 Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP). Faculty retired under the FERP retain departmental voting rights. They retain a full vote regardless of their academic assignment in a given semester and can vote provided they take part in the deliberations preceding the vote.

4. Temporary Faculty Departmental Voting Rights.

Temporary faculty have proportional voting rights in the department(s) in which they serve equal to the proportion of time they are serving in the department(s).
4.1 Voting rights of temporary faculty are terminated by suspension, complete retirement, or other termination of employment.

4.2 Voting rights of temporary faculty are suspended for any semester in which the individual holds a full-time administrative or other non-faculty position in the university.

4.3 Leaves. Unless otherwise determined by department policy, temporary faculty who would be entitled to participate in departmental proceedings if not on leave, may participate and vote while on leave, provided they take part in the deliberations preceding the vote.

5. Department Chair Voting Rights.

As primary steward of a department, the department chair has full voting rights exclusively in the department they chair during their term, whether or not it has been their department of permanent assignment and regardless of the level of assignment (i.e., 0.4, 0.6).

6. Student, staff, or other non-faculty voting rights.

While students, staff, or other non-faculty may participate on some departmental committees, organizations, and other such groups, they may not be granted departmental voting rights.

7. Matters requiring formal votes.

Matters requiring formal votes by all faculty shall minimally include nomination and selection of chairs, departmental mergers, name changes, establishment of standing committees and the membership for committees such as: RTP, curricula, hiring, admissions. Matters requiring formal votes exclusively by regular faculty (tenured, tenure track) shall include curricular policies and program requirements for students (inclusive of establishing or modifying courses, standard texts and materials).

The regular faculty (tenured and tenure track) must approve through a formal vote a department policy that articulates the process to be used for approval of curriculum at the department level prior to advancing to the college level.


Department faculty (regular and temporary) will determine the acceptable mechanism and timeline for voting (e.g., paper ballots, double envelope, email, online, show of hands) for department matters in general. They may select different methods for various types of decisions (i.e., nomination and selection of chairs, committee establishment and actions, curricula) if desired, unless otherwise stipulated or precluded by University policy, collective bargaining agreement, and/or
lacks. If the Department does not have an established voting procedure at the time
a decision is to be made, a vote by secret ballot conducted by the Chair and
documented in meeting minutes shall be the default practice.

8.1 Any selected method must include a process for verifying the proportion
and eligibility of those voting.

8.2 When a vote has been by secret ballot, the method used and the
reporting of results must be done in such a way as to not reveal the identity
of voters.

8.3 Voting shall only be conducted after a proposal has been discussed in
person (inclusive of online tools).


Because of the importance of deliberations in resolving conflicts and determining
policies, proxy and absentee voting in departmental matters is permissible only if
authorized by a specific departmental policy.
San José State University
Academic Senate AS 1622
Curriculum and Research Committee
April 25, 2016
First Reading

Policy Recommendation

Academic Certificate Programs: Review and Approval Process

Rescinds: S12-5 and S13-10

Rationale:
Executive Order #806 from the Chancellor’s office provided a framework for offering certificate programs and encouraged the development of such programs. The existing certificate policies, S12-5--Policy Recommendation, Review and Approval Process for Academic Certificate Programs and S13-10--Policy Recommendation, Modify the Review and Approval Process for Academic Certificates, provide the review and approval process for the current certificate process at SJSU (including earning certificates through Open University). As described in Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 40400 provides that the Board of Trustees, upon recommendation of the faculty of a campus, shall issue a certificate to a student who has completed the prescribed course of study. However, certificate ‘programs’ cannot be completed entirely through Open University.

Resolved: That the following be adopted as policy; and be it further
Resolved: That all certificate programs at SJSU must be reviewed and approved under the process outlined in the attached guidelines; and be it further
Resolved: That, within two years, certificate programs that predate the adoption of this policy must be reviewed and approved under the attached guidelines; and be it further
Resolved: That only certificates from approved certificate programs can be awarded and posted on transcripts.

Certificate Guidelines
Types of Certificate Programs

1) Certificate programs are defined as any program in which some form of recognition from San Jose State University is awarded to participants. There are two basic kinds of certificate programs, Academic and Other (defined below) but only the former is the subject of this policy.
2) Academic certificate programs
a) **Definition**: Certificate programs are classified as “Academic” if students receive academic credit for any courses in the program.

b) Types of Academic certificate programs

i) Basic (undergraduate level)

(1) **Definition**: Basic certificate programs provide opportunities for students to pursue specialized, often pre-professional, focused educational objectives that may be separate from a degree program.

(2) **Jurisdiction**: Basic certificate programs are under the jurisdiction of the Undergraduate Studies (UGS) Committee and administered by the Office of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs (GUP).

ii) Advanced (graduate level)

(1) **Definition**: An advanced certificate program offers post-baccalaureate students coursework leading to a specific, applied, focused goal.

(2) **Jurisdiction**: Advanced certificate programs are under the jurisdiction of the Graduate Studies and Research (GS&R) Committee and administered by GUP.

3) Other certificate programs

a) **Definition**: Certificate programs are classified as “Other” if no academic credit or grade is awarded for completion of courses in the program.

b) **Jurisdiction**: College of International and Extended Studies oversees these certificates in consultation with the AVP of GUP.

**General Guidelines for Academic Certificate Programs**

1) Self-supporting certificate programs, both basic and advanced, credit and non-credit, will be administered by College of International and Extended Studies, but curricular reviews will be overseen by GUP.

2) State-support certificate programs must be credit bearing and must go through the curricular review process overseen by GUP.

3) Academic certificate programs should establish at least one advisor or director to oversee certificate programs within the unit.

4) Certificate programs that are classifiable as “Academic” that do not meet the criteria for this policy must be discontinued or go through a review process prior to Fall 2018.

**Specific to Academic Basic Certificate Programs**

**Requirements**

1) Basic certificate programs must include a minimum of 9 units and maximum of 18 units of coursework. Programs may require that all prerequisite coursework has been completed prior to enrolling in the basic certificate program. At least 6 units must be completed at SJSU.
2) Basic certificate programs may include lower-division and upper-division courses numbered 1 through 199 (excluding individual studies, directed reading, supervision, and credit/no-credit courses).

3) A clearly stated assessment plan with learning outcomes must be included in the certificate proposal.

4) Unless otherwise stated in the catalog, courses taken as part of an SJSU Academic Certificate program can be applied to an approved major, minor, or emphasis program where one is required for the student’s degree. Unless otherwise stated in the catalog, courses taken for a major or minor may be applied to a basic certificate program upon approval from the basic certificate program advisor/director.

5) Students must have a minimum GPA of 2.0 in basic certificate coursework in order to be awarded a certificate. However, departments or comparable units may elect to set more stringent standards to ensure the quality of certificate holders with respect to the program.

6) The advisor/director of the program is responsible for verifying a student’s satisfactory completion of the academic requirements established for the program and for forwarding a copy of the certificate completion form to the Office of the Registrar. The Office of the Registrar records the completion of the program on the student’s transcript.

Specific to Academic Advanced Certificate Programs

Requirements

1) Advanced certificate programs must include a minimum of 9 units and maximum of 18 units of coursework.

2) Advanced certificate programs must be comprised of courses numbered 100 through 296 (excluding individual studies, directed reading, supervision, and credit/no-credit courses).

3) A clearly stated assessment plan with learning outcomes must be included in the proposal.

4) With the approval of the department or school, units may be applied to both an advanced certificate program and a graduate degree program offered by the department.

5) All advanced certificate programs must be constructed solely with courses taken through San José State University.

   a) The choice of grading requirements may have implications for transferability to degree programs.

   b) Students must maintain a minimum GPA of 3.0 in all advanced certificate coursework, with no less than the grade of “C” in any course. A maximum of 4 units of coursework with a grade of “C” can count toward an advanced certificate.

   c) A maximum of 4 units of coursework may be repeated. The grade used for the GPA for the advanced certificate is the average of the initial grade and the grade upon repeating the course.

   d) Advanced certificate courses are available to matriculated (regular or special session status) and non-matriculated (Open University) students. A maximum of 6
units may be taken through Open University. However, the program cannot be fully completed through Open University.
e) While advanced certificate courses can be taken through Open University, a maximum of 30% of any graduate degree program units can be completed from another institution and/or units from Open University (including advanced certificate courses) at SJSU with approval from the department or school.
6) The advisor/director of the certificate program is responsible for verifying a student’s satisfactory completion of the academic requirements established for the program and for forwarding the certificate completion form to Graduate Admissions and Program Evaluations (GAPE). After review, GAPE notifies the Office of the Registrar which then records the completion of the program on the student’s transcript.
7) These guidelines constitute minimum standards for advanced certificate programs; departments may propose additional requirements for approval by the GS&R Committee.
8) Admission
   a) Students seeking an advanced certificate in matriculated status must apply for admission and will be evaluated at the university level with respect to the applicable entrance requirements and then according to the approved requirements set forth by the individual certificate program. A department or program can propose more restrictive requirements subject to approval by the GS&R committee.
   b) Admission to an advanced certificate program requires a bachelor’s degree from an accredited institution, with a major in the appropriate field(s) of study, as well as a GPA of at least 2.5 (where A=4).
   c) There is no conditional admission to advanced certificate programs.
   d) Departments/programs offering advanced certificate programs may specify subject matter and/or coursework prerequisites for admission into the certificate program. Such prerequisites must be listed in the university catalog. Prerequisite courses or equivalent experience must demonstrate current and appropriate preparation as determined by the program. All other grading regulations of the graduate school apply to the courses in the certificate programs (e.g., the prohibition against taking graded classes pass/fail).
   e) Where appropriate, some form of portfolio presentation, performance audition, or other evidence of specific competence may be required for admission. Such criteria will also be listed in the catalog.

**Process for Proposing and Reviewing Academic Certificate Programs**
1) All courses in a certificate program must undergo the normal course approval process prior to approval of the certificate course package.
2) Proposal Content:
   a) SJSU College Dean Curricular Proposal Approval Form(s).
   b) Brief statement of purpose.
   c) Clearly stated learning outcomes mapped to coursework.
   d) Catalog copy, which includes the following:
169  i. Brief statement of purpose.
170  ii. Admissions requirements.
171  iii. Course requirements.
172  iv. Any prerequisites for the certificate program.
173  v. Total number of units.
174  g) GPA needed to receive the certificate if other than a minimum of 2.0 for basic
certificates and 3.0 for advanced certificates.
176  h) Program advisor.
177  i) For advanced certificates: number of units applicable (if any) to a degree and/or
major depending upon matriculation status (with the caveat that the units may not be
uniformly applied but require advisor consent).
178  3) Submission process
179  a) Academic certificate programs (either basic or advanced) may be proposed by
department, school or college curriculum committees.
183  b) Proposals may be submitted, reviewed, and approved at any time during the
academic year.
185  c) For entry into the catalog, the approval must be registered with GUP according to
published catalog deadlines.
187  4) Review process for new proposals
188  The reviewing bodies are responsible for timely review and approval of academic certificate
programs:
190  a. Proposals from either department or college level curriculum committees are
submitted to the appropriate department chair(s) or school director(s) for review.
192  b. Upon approval, the department or school reviews are then submitted with a copy
of the proposal to the appropriate curriculum committee(s) and college dean(s) for
review and approval.
195  c. Upon approval of the college deans, a copy of the proposal (along with reviews
from departmental/school and deans) is submitted to the Chair of the appropriate
operating committee.
198  i. If the program contains any 200 level courses, the materials are referred to
the Chair of the GS&R Committee for review.
200  ii. If the program does not contain any 200 level courses, the materials are
referred to the Chair of the UGS Committee for review.
202  iii. During duty days, within one week, the committee Chair will determine if
the Committee needs to review the proposal. If no full committee review is
required, the proposal and accompanying reviews are submitted to the
Provost via the appropriate office (GS&R for programs with 200 level courses
or UGS for proposals with 100 level programs) with a statement from the
Chair specifying that a review from their committee was not necessary.
208  d. If review by the appropriate operating committee is necessary, the Chair of the
operating committee will send recommendations from the committees, along with the
5) Review process for existing certificate programs
   a) Substitution, deletion, or addition of courses to the program will need to go through
      the minor program change process in the GUP office.
   b) Certificates involving multiple programs will be assigned to a home department
      under which to be reviewed.

Approved (C&R): April 18, 2016
Vote: 9-0-0
Present: Anagnos, Bacich, Buzanski, Clements, Heil, Mathur, Schultz-Krohn, Sibley, Stacks
Absent: Backer, Matoush, Sarras
Financial Impact: Certificate programs have the potential to increase revenue if students enroll through special session.
Workload Impact: As certificate programs are developed or adopted:
1. The development of certificate proposals will require one faculty member to oversee each program.
2. Proposals will increase the number of materials for review and approval for curriculum committees, Chairs/Directors, Deans, UGS or GS&R, and the GUP office.
3. CMS and Enrollment Services may have increased workload to matriculate certificate students.