

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE

2019/2020

Agenda

February 10, 2020, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm

Engineering 285/287

- I. **Call to Order and Roll Call:**
- II. **Approval of Minutes:**
 - Senate Minutes of December 16, 2020
- 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 –
 - EC Minutes of December 9, 2019
 - EC Minutes of January 27, 2020
 - B. Consent Calendar –
 - Consent Calendar of February 10, 2020
 - C. Executive Committee Action Items –
- V. **Unfinished Business:**
- VI. **Special Order of Business:** Vote on One-Year Extension for Senate Chair
- VII. **Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation)**
 - A. University Library Board (ULB):
 - ULB Update on Funding, Acquisitions, Services, and Staffing by Maureen Smith, Time Certain: 3:00 p.m.***
 - B. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
 - AS 1760, Policy Recommendation, Undergraduate Students Earning Graduate Credit (First Reading)***
 - C. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
 - AS 1741, Policy Recommendation, English Language Proficiency Requirement for SJSU Applicants (Final Reading)***
 - AS 1759, Policy Recommendation, Students' Rights to Timely Feedback on Class Assignments (Final Reading)***

- D. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
AS 1756, Amendment B to University Policy S15-8, Retention, Tenure, and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and Standards (Final Reading)

AS 1761, Policy Recommendation, Amendment B to University Policy S15-7, Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Procedures Concerning Small Colleges (First Reading)
- E. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
AS 1762, Policy Recommendation, Modifying Seats on the Program Planning Committee and the Accreditation Review Committee, Amendment B to University Policy S17-11; and Amendment B to University Policy S16-5 (Final Reading)

AS 1763, Senate Management Resolution, Update to Senate Standing Rules (First Reading)

VIII. **Special Committee Reports:**
Faculty Affairs Report on Recruitment of a Diverse Faculty by Senior Director of Faculty Affairs, Dr. James Lee, Time Certain: 3:25 p.m.

IX. **New Business:**

X. **State of the University Announcements:**

- A. Associated Students President
- B. Vice President for Administration and Finance
- C. Vice President for Student Affairs
- D. Chief Diversity Officer
- E. CSU Faculty Trustee (by standing invitation)
- F. Statewide Academic Senators
- G. Provost

XI. **Adjournment**

2019-2020 Academic Senate

**MINUTES
December 16, 2019**

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Forty-Three Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

Present: Frazier, Van Selst, Curry,
Parent, Mathur
Absent: Rodan

CHHS Representatives:

Present: Schultz-Krohn, Shifflett, Grosvenor, Chin, Sen
Absent: None

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Del Casino, Faas
Absent: Papazian, Day, Wong(Lau)

COB Representatives:

Present: He
Absent: Khavul

Deans / AVPs:

Present: Lattimer, Ehrman, d'Alarcao
Absent: None

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Marachi
Absent: None

Students:

Present: Kaur, Gallo, Trang
Birrerr, Roque
Absent: Delgadillo (AS excused)

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Sullivan-Green, Kumar, Okamoto
Absent: Ramasubramanian

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters

H&A Representatives:

Present: Riley, Kitajima, McKee, Khan
Absent: Coelho

Emeritus Representative:

Present: McClory

SCI Representatives:

Present: Cargill, French, Muller, White
Absent: None

Honorary Representative:

Present: Lessow-Hurley

SOS Representatives:

Present: Peter, Hart, Lombardi, Jackson
Absent: Wilson (Jury Duty)

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Masegian, Monday,
Higgins
Absent: None

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes– The Senate minutes of November 18, 2019 were unanimously approved as written.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate –

Chair Mathur announced that the President could not be here today due to a scheduling conflict.

About a month ago the Academic Affairs Committee of the ASCSU met and developed a resolution regarding the implementation of an Ethnic Studies system requirement. Our CSU Statewide Senator Julia Curry distributed this to our Senate on behalf of the CSU Statewide Senators and she also noted that campuses needed to provide individual feedback. At this past Thursday's CSU Campus Chair's meeting, Catherine Nelson,

the ASCSU Chair noted that Senates should and could provide feedback regarding this resolution. Chair Mathur asks that you provide feedback before January 10, 2020. This will allow our campus Senate to provide more directed information to the ASCSU regarding that resolution.

There are still lots of opportunities to provide input to the search for a new Chancellor. Please check out the Chancellor's website for ways to provide information to the search committee.

As a reminder, Vice Chair McKee has sent out a "Save the Date" for Senate Retreat on January 31, 2020.

There are cupcakes and cider in the back of the room in honor of the winter break.

Questions:

Q: First take on last Friday's GE meeting?

A: It was very successful day. Over 70 faculty attended on a final's day. The morning was focused on the revision of the program learning outcomes for the GE program. We got lots of feedback. The afternoon session focused on area learning outcomes.

This session provides a lot of great feedback for C&R to move forward with revising the 2014 GE Guidelines. The Provost gave a presentation on the future of GE and GE innovation at SJSU. This generated a lot of interesting discussion. The Director of General Education at CSU East Bay and also Chair of the General Studies Committee, Caron Inouye, was a facilitator. We had representation from every college. It was impressive to see that many faculty members show up during finals. Day two of the summit is coming up on January 24, 2020. This summit will be held in the Student Union Ballroom, and will focus on assessment. It will also be open to the entire campus. There will be at least one or two assessment experts as facilitators on this day as well.

Chair Mathur wished everyone a wonderful holiday season and said we will all meet again at the Senate Retreat on January 31, 2020.

B. From the President of the University – Not present

IV. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

Executive Committee Minutes of November 4, 2019- No questions

Executive Committee Minutes of December 2, 2019- No questions

B. Consent Calendar:

Consent Calendar of December 16, 2019. There was no dissent to the consent calendar as amended by AVC Marachi.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

Chair Mathur presented *AS 1761, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Celebrating 20*

Years of Service-Learning at San José State University (Final Reading). The Senate voted and AS 1761 passed unanimously.

V. Unfinished Business:

VI. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation)

A. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):

Senator White presented AS 1760, *Policy Recommendation, Undergraduate Students Earning Graduate Credit (First Reading)*. C&R is recommending rescinding S89-2 and replacing it with this policy. As C&R went through the old policy there were a lot of edits and C&R thought it best to rescind and replace.

Questions:

Q: Three questions regarding part 3, when you refer to the 30-unit requirement for the bachelor's degree, I'm assuming you are referring to the requirements in the major of the degree and not the 120 units?

A: It is 30 units needed to complete the degree.

Q: Why not 15 or 17 units given the number of 4-unit courses that are taught?

A: We got no feedback on that and that was what was in the original policy.

Q: I have a question about number 2. It says students will have applied to graduate from their baccalaureate program prior to enrolling in a graduate level course. What if you have a brilliant junior who wants to enroll in graduate course for enrichment and the instructor and adviser think that is a great idea, why would that person be restricted from enrolling if they haven't applied to graduate?

A: Great question, C&R did not consider it. I will take it back to the committee.

Q: Are there situations where an undergraduate student might be taking graduate courses that are required for their minor as a baccalaureate student that would then not be able to be counted in the graduate program?

A: We will consider this.

Q: In 3c. it talks about a GPA of 2.75 or better in all work completed while in upper division standing, what does upper division standing mean? Is it everything the student has taken since they hit 50 units? There is no place in MySJSU that calculates that GPA. You would have to go in and calculate that GPA course by course.

A: Upper division standing for us means 100 units, but this needs to be clarified.

C: Yes, that needs to be clarified. That is extra work for the advisers to calculate the GPA as well.

A: The committee will consider this.

Q: My question pertains to number 4. For an undergraduate to get graduate credit what would the minimum GPA be for those 15 units?

A: An undergraduate student could transfer in a course with a "C" provided their overall graduate GPA was a 3.0 or better.

C: We have graduate programs that have varying GPAs for admission into a graduate program. It is a little bit concerning to me that students are being held to a higher standard in order to do that in their last semester than it would require to get into the graduate program.

A: This policy is about students who want to earn credit in a course that will get graduate credit. There are different places on the transcript for different types of courses. You can take a graduate course and not have it count as part of the graduate record. This policy will allow undergraduates to take a limited number of courses that could be used for graduate credit should they go on for their master's degree. This policy is about courses taken for graduate credit. The GPA requirement and unit limit are interpreted to protect the undergraduate student from biting off more than they can chew.

Q: There is confusion between the title and number 1. Earning graduate credit is different than petitioning to take graduate level courses. Is there a way to simplify some of this to get to the point, clean up number 3? The larger issue is what is credit.

A: The committee will clarify.

C: Under the old policy students could only take graduate courses when they had 15 or less units to complete in the baccalaureate program. Often graduate students have to take certain courses every other semester. The idea was to open this up so that students could take courses during their last 30 units.

Q: Should there be some parameters for which courses can be taken? Does it fall under the department's purview which courses can or can't be taken by a student?

A: I will take that back to the committee.

Q: In item 1 it says they will petition to their major advisor, is that their undergraduate major advisor?

A: That is correct.

Q: Is the major advisor recommending to that graduate program that the undergraduate student be allowed to take the course?

A: I think that is part of the discussion we need on this.

Q: When the graduate advisor is signing off on candidacy forms, how does the graduate adviser know which graduate courses were used towards the baccalaureate degree?

A: It does not show on the transcript, but when they apply to graduate they have to list the courses they plan to take for the undergraduate degree and that creates a contract between the university and the student. If that course is not on the contract, it will still go on the transcript but not count towards the degree.

Q: How does the graduate adviser know when looking at the candidacy form which classes may have been used for baccalaureate degree?

A: They would work that out with their adviser. That is the reason we are recommending they go through the adviser as well.

Q: Lots of departments are going online and not using major advising forms in hard

copy. It may not be easy to always tell so can you check on this?

A: We talked to the Registrar's Office about this, and they do that evaluation. This would also only be for SJSU students. C&R will verify.

C: One of most important people to sign off on whether the student could be successful in taking the course would be the faculty member. Why have a 2.75 GPA, we should make this clean. I would simplify the language in 3 and make sure the faculty member has a say in this.

B. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):

Senator Sullivan-Green presented *AS 1741, Policy Recommendation, English Language Proficiency Requirement for SJSU Applicants (First Reading)*. The main thing to note here is that this recommendation establishes standards for both baccalaureate students and post baccalaureate, or graduate students. It also allows students to request a waiver through their department.

Questions:

Q: Where it talks about "alternative methods" on line 67, you might say "alternative methods and task report."

A: There are consistent parameters set across those tests on the website. We elected not to put it in here, because we opted to list only the primary test and not all of them. We went with the standard, and then you can find a comparable.

Senator Sullivan-Green presented *AS 1759, Policy Recommendation, Student's Rights to Timely Feedback on Class Assignments (First Reading)*.

We did not want to put a specific timeframe on what timely feedback is because it varies. We felt that we would make a framework that suggests that faculty should establish a timeframe on when students should expect feedback.

Questions:

Q: F13-1 rescinded F68-18, if you rescind F13-1 do we need to go back and make sure F68-18 goes away?

A: We will take a look at that.

C: A policy is like a living being in that once it has been killed it can't come back.

Q: Should we consider norms? If we allow the teacher to say I'll give it back to you on this date, what if the professor puts that date at the end of the semester?

A: We have to give faculty the benefit of the doubt. The rule of thumb is kind of 2 weeks, but it doesn't always fit. We talked about this at length and elected not to put a time frame in here. We can reconsider this, but we did discuss it at length.

Q: F13-1 was a little more specific in terms of what kind of feedback to give e.g. to know their scores, to review their graded work, etc. What was the committee's reason for eliminating the examples? Also, what was the committee's discussion along the lines of reasonable times and perhaps making some suggestion of what reasonable

time is?

A: We did have a discussion on trying to define feedback. We did have a representative on the committee from the Student Fairness Committee who gave good information. We elected to lean on the side of feedback as being an indication of a grade standard. We felt feedback was descriptive enough for a grade on an assignment. We elected to remove the norms of the typical two-weeks. It just didn't pan out for a lot of faculty situations that faculty reflected about.

Q: Listening to the comments, have there been egregious comments in the past that have led us here? Also, who adjudicates this if the student finds this intolerable?

A: Yes, there have been instances of faculty not holding up their end. The Student Fairness Committee (SFC) is the place where students can grieve this. There is a policy that says students should first go to the instructor, then the department chair, next the dean, and finally the Student Fairness Committee. Students do have a grievance process for this.

Q: On line 52-54 it states faculty should indicate the expected time frame and students should be notified of if there is a new timeframe.

A: There is also a place on the SOTEs for students to indicate their feedback.

C: There were egregious cases of students not getting any materials back until after finals. That is the reason we had to have a policy. In regards to F13-1, the committee thought it would be a gigantic undertaking to combine all policies on grading, syllabi, and grading into one policy at that time but now that F18-5 has passed, would I&SA consider?

A: I did discuss this with Senator White, but C&R did not feel like it fit the structure of F18-5.

C. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

Senator Peter presented *AS 1756, Amendment B to University Policy S15-8, Retention, Tenure, and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and Standards (First Reading)*.

This has to do with two paragraphs in the RTP policy that describe what the standards are for the various levels of achievement. In particular, this has to do with the minimum level of achievement needed to earn tenure. We aren't suggesting changes to what an excellent or good rating would be, but only to what the baseline minimum standard would be. The problem originated when we learned that the norm for the SOTE survey sometimes reached down to 4.0. The norms are established by the Student Evaluation Review Board (SERB). The norms currently are in the 20th through the 80th percentile. A lot of people get confused by this and think the average is the norm. The norm is a range. Teaching as a whole in the university is pretty good. Which means some people are below the 20th percentile and are still earning a 4.0. A 4.0 on the current instrument means the students agree with the statement the teaching was effective. It seemed inappropriate to us to punish faculty by saying they

don't meet our standards even when students are saying they are effective. What kicked this off is that there are effective teachers who are falling below the norm who are then not eligible for promotion to Professor. We need to find a way to stop the harm. PS did consider a baseline without a norm, but did not go that way. As we began to look at the problem overall, we also became aware teaching is not always being evaluated as holistically as the policy calls for. There is a tendency to focus almost exclusively on SOTEs. We were looking for ways to redo this descriptor to make this clear that faculty are being evaluated for their teaching in a wide variety of different forms of information. The rewrite adds a few things. It adds kind of an either/or for qualifying for baseline. The evaluations will either be within the norms or otherwise there is a preponderance of evidence of teaching competence and effectiveness. While almost all of you who have been through the process have submitted syllabi and other materials, the policy doesn't actually require it. We wanted to insert that into the baseline descriptor not to make the process more onerous, but to impress upon the committees that when they evaluate teaching they need to take account of things beyond the SOTEs. We also wanted to insert in the descriptor itself, the same phrase that appears in the teaching evaluation policy about a holistic judgment of teaching effectiveness. There could be some more changes over the next month as we keep crafting this.

Questions:

Q: On line 80, would the committee consider changing, "or otherwise offer a preponderance of evidence..." to "or otherwise offer materials that show a preponderance of evidence..."

A: I see what you are saying. The surveys give evidence beyond those 13 questions. There are subjective answers. We need a better phrase than preponderance of evidence to communicate that. What we want to communicate is that committees need to look at the entire survey instrument, objective and subjective, not just question 13. However, we will find a different phrase to say this. Looking only at question 13 is a shortcut many of the committees take, but it is a bad shortcut.

Q: The narrative might be really glowing in the evaluation, but when it comes to the score it sometimes doesn't reflect that. Reviewers are a little more conservative with the scores as opposed to when they are writing the narrative. Is there a way to have language that guides the reviewers regarding this in the policy?

A: Let me be sure I understand. You are saying the reviewers might say this is an excellent candidate, but then vote baseline?

Q: Yes. I'm not sure how this can be addressed, but it is an issue.

A: The committee will consider it.

Q: Is the goal of this policy to tell evaluators to look at a broader sample, or is it that they didn't achieve the norm so now reviewers need to go a little more in-depth? I'm just curious how we should view the policy and how it is currently phrased?

A: There are two goals for this particular amendment. First, the policy does talk about a holistic evaluation of teaching, and the teaching evaluation policy, which is referenced by the RTP policy and emphasizes that, every measure passed by the

Senate for 30 years has declared that SOTEs are but one component. However, the way in which the descriptors get put together and the way in which committees look for shortcuts can result in a tendency to rely too much on the results of one question in one part of the total evidence assembled, so making it clearer that teaching needs to be judged holistically is a part of the reason for this amendment. There was a very specific problem that kicked it all off. There are effective teachers, at least judged effective by their students, that are falling below the norms and they were not eligible for tenure. That seemed inappropriate to us. We had a positive goal of creating a holistic evaluation, but also wanted to get out of this trap with this weird interaction of norms and the way the instrument is phrased. We have to change this aspect so no one is harmed.

Q: Given that the published research recently suggests that SOTEs should not be used in RTP guidelines, would the PS Committee consider eliminating the word “norm” from the policy completely and just saying that SOTEs should be provided in the dossier?

A: One of the various options that PS has looked at with regards to the baseline was a normless description. It was not the option that the PS Committee chose to go with today, but if you consider the way this amendment is phrased being within the norm is more than one way to establish you are being effective. In a sense, there is no requirement to meet a norm SOLATE to be judged worthy of tenure, so it kind of is a little bit of both. Norms can be a little protective of faculty too. If students have a voice at all, it should be one component and norms are one way of expressing that component.

Q: If norms are going to stay in, would PS consider being a little bit more normal with the norm and indicate that norms are calculated from the entire faculty body. Also, 55% of the faculty are lecturers and that should be referenced in the norms of the tenure/tenure-track.

A: Interestingly, there is nothing in the RTP policy that says which norm should be A, B, C. SERB could establish 100 norms. There could be different norms for lab classes and GE classes. SERB can do as many as they think appropriate and I would encourage them to create norms that reflect the different styles and kinds of teaching. I do believe the SOLATEs are normed differently than the SOTEs. You could have different norms for departments, colleges, and the whole university. There is nothing in the RTP policy that says which of these norms is referenced. We could have lots of different options for this and we probably should.

Q: On line 77, where you say, “take into account the nature, subject, and level of classes taught, ...,” could you add “size of classes” also?

A: That’s a good idea. That’s a phrase that comes from the teaching evaluation policy.

Q: If you are saying the teachers are receiving 4’s, but we are saying you are not good enough if you are a 4, but the students are saying we agree with the statement it is such a mismatch. I’d like to see student voices heard, but is there some way to

bring this in alignment?

A: That is what we are trying to do here. It depends on the semester. Some semesters a 4 is below the norm and sometimes it isn't. That is exactly what the problem is now and what needs to be fixed. We will continue to try and refine the language.

Q: At some point would the committee consider talking about the survey both quantitative and qualitative results?

A: We would consider it and will consider it. We are trying to balance a precise descriptor with one that gets overly wordy. I, personally, find qualitative comments to be very useful.

Q: The first part of this paragraph seems like criteria then it takes a side trip into instruction for the people interpreting the criteria. You say by the end of the review period these things support a holistic judgment. Can you tease this out and put it somewhere else? As a candidate, I don't need to see that part.

A: The committee will consider it.

Senator Peter presented *AS 1755, Policy Recommendation, Updating and Changing Titles Associated with Faculty Affairs (Final Reading)*.

The Senate voted and AS 1755 passed as written unanimously.

D. Organization and Government Committee (O&G): No report.

E. University Library Board (ULB): No report.

VII. Special Committee Reports:

VIII. New Business:

IX. State of the University Announcements:

A. Vice President for Administration and Finance:

Lots and lots of construction is going on all across campus. The Science building is going up and they are working on steel on the third floor. This project is on budget and on time.

The AS House has been put on its foundation.

The 1,500 car parking garage at South Campus will be done next fall. Most of the infrastructure is in place. We are looking at clearing the hill on the East side of the football stadium. The East side of the stadium will come down. We will then build a 3 story Athletics building with locker rooms, and men's football facilities.

Questions:

Q: I'm concerned about recycling on this campus. We used to have recycling bins

and paper containers about 10 years ago and these have disappeared. Then we used to have cardboard boxes and they are gone now too. Can we get them back?

A: All recycling is being put together now and is separated later so all is well. We are utilizing single stream recycling.

Q: Can you say a little more about the theatre?

A: It is a 120-person two-story classroom theatre. There will be easel boards and academic areas in there. The business school is talking about moving their operations from Santa Clara back on campus. We are trying to find good uses for that space.

Q: What about contamination with the recycling? Is there a way to monitor the old way and the new way?

A: We had to do this same process before, because people did not follow sorting rules even when we had the three boxes.

Q: Can you advertise about this single stream recycling?

A: I will put it in the next newsletter after the first of the year.

Q: We've all heard stories about recycling not going where it is supposed to go. It would go a long way to have you tell people in the newsletter about this.

A: I will make that happen. Happy Holidays.

B. Vice President for Student Affairs: No report.

C. Chief Diversity Officer: No report.

D. CSU Faculty Trustee (by standing invitation): The CSU Faculty Trustee submitted his report electronically to the Academic Senate.

E. Statewide Academic Senators:

Senator Curry announced three items from the ASCSU:

AS 3403-19 is the recommendation of an Ethnic Studies system requirement. We did send out a notice to you all asking you to tell your colleges and departments to give feedback by the January 10, 2020 deadline.

The Community College Senate UC pathways is an upcoming item to align the transfer preparation for UC and CSU. Senator Van Selst reported in some cases this will make sense and in other cases it will not and would run afoul of the CSU 120-unit limit.

The quantitative reasoning proposal remains on the Board of Trustees Agenda for January 2020. You have all had the opportunity to provide feedback. Feedback is very important. AB 1460, in particular, the Ethnic Studies requirement was very conflicting discussion for some and exciting for other, but it is very important.

Question:

Q: I have heard last week that the Intersegmental Committee removed its opposition to the community colleges offering the baccalaureate degree in particular Nursing and

Occupational Therapy. I'd like to know if the ASCSU has been discussing this and what that means for our Nursing program at SJSU?

A: The original pilots were executed without CSU consultation. The newer proposal is to expand that. The answer was that we already have a CSU system to offer Bachelor's degrees, all we need is funding to expand. There are ways to share resources to offer CSU degrees through community college campuses. That is the most recent proposal I'm aware of.

Q: I've been following the media attention around the quantitative reasoning proposals. What entity proposed the Quantitative Reasoning proposal?

A: The Quantitative Reasoning Taskforce Report from three years ago recommended two changes. One was to remove Intermediate Algebra and the other was to trade that for a broader experience on data communication units. That should have been a one-on-one trade, but the CSU dropped the Intermediate Algebra then waited two years, and then decided to ensure we have numeric fluency. The fourth year of quantitative reasoning is really the replacement to Intermediate Algebra, so the origin of that comes from the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Report.

F. Provost:

Thanks to everyone for getting through the semester. Thanks for a great and very kind welcome.

A few key things that are going on and where we are going are tied very much to things I've been learning in my first semester. There has been a lot of conversation going on around the faculty and its organization and how we are going to do that over time. I have some opinions about that. We have to operationalize and to sit down and really have some conversations. What I mean by that is what are the ratios between our tenure/tenure-track faculty and our lecturers. I think this is something we really have to think about. I'll talk about more of this in a second.

I never expected how much time Golden Shores of the CSU would take out of the life of the Provost. I think, by the way, we can drop new now from Provost. I've been worn down some by the CSU system in the sense that I spend a couple of nights a week once a month at least out of town. I did have an opportunity to go to an interesting summit this past week on climate change literacy. I have some strong opinions, having been a K-12 teacher in this state about adding one more thing to the curriculum of the K-12 educators. I'm not a big fan of unfunded mandates even if they have the best intent, so I think there could be some more conversation coming out of that.

One of the big things for me is the investment in the faculty here. I want to acknowledge and hope people are paying attention that need to bring the Op-Ed project here this spring to next fall with the Public Voices Fellowship. I sent a lot of information out on it. If people haven't really looked at it the deadline is in January 2020. This is a really amazing project. This is a whole year where we will pick 20 fellows who will sit down in four day-long workshops over the course of a year and

develop their voices on how to translate their scholarship into public dialogue. The schools that have done this so far are the Stanford's, the Duke's, and Arizona. Among those 20 fellows, the three years I was at Arizona they average 80 to 85 Op Eds included where they were in *Scientific American* and *Wired* magazines. I wanted to bring this project here. There are important people here doing incredible work. We need to do more of this type of thing for our people. This is a first step.

Many faculty have asked me to talk about where we are with regard to Retention-Tenure-Promotion. I'm going to read a little bit of a message that will go out tomorrow regarding faculty recruitment and retention. "Institutions of higher education are built on collaboration, but they also grow through a productive engagement with their tensions. I think it is important for us to discuss some of the conversations that have taken place on the campus regarding faculty recruitment and retention. As I hope everyone can appreciate, privacy protections greatly restrict our ability to talk about individual personal cases even if some of those cases have been involuntarily cast into the public view. Over the past five years, 2014-2019, 96% of the faculty who completed the entire process for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor were successful. Over the same time period, 89% of individuals who applied for promotion to full professor were granted that promotion. These numbers do not include those that applied for early promotion. Early promotion is a more challenging bar. Everyone between 2014 and 2017 who applied for early promotion, when they went up 100% received early promotion. For the tenure promotion data, for those denied over the past five years and not given additional years of probation, 67% were White. At the promotion to full level, 81% of faculty of color that applied for full promotion were granted that promotion. Compared to the 89% overall, you can see that we have a gap. Of those faculty some sought promotion in their first eligible year, while others have taken some time to apply. Outside of these numbers though, I think it is even more important to understand what is going on, because we have faculty who are not applying for promotion from Associate to Full Professor. I apologize that this is focused on tenure/tenure-track faculty, but that is where this conversation is right now. Please don't feel marginalized by this.

This year the campus had 74 faculty eligible to apply for full professor, but only two applied. The majority had been in rank for no more than seven years. Clearly, we have a challenge in the Associate rank. It is a challenge I think impacts the institution in serious ways. I suspect that some of that lies in the guidance and mentorship we give faculty in their departments and colleges. Prior to their promotion to Associate Professor, faculty are given yearly assessments and feedback and protected from work that might drive them away from their goals. At the Associate level, with more flexibility to manage workload, they are invited to take on a lot more and they do. This work contributes greatly to the mission of the university and the success of our students, particularly the underrepresented students. The value of this increased set of responsibilities is not easily represented. In short, the collective group can do a lot more. I'd like to talk about a few things I think we might do.

First, Dr. Wong(Lau) and I are putting together a taskforce on Inclusive Faculty

Success which we are launching this spring and I don't want a think tank to talk about what our problems are, I want a strategy and planning group on how we can better support Associate Professors, because I think we identified the core crux of our challenge here.

Second, I will work with Senior Deputy Provost Carl Kemnitz and Dr. Deanna Fassett on additional programming for Associate Professors in professional development. Of course, Dr. Wong(Lau) will continue to work with Dr. James Lee, Senior Director of Faculty Affairs to ensure comprehensive training on the RTP process.”

I was silent during this conversation today, but I actually think this training needs to be mandatory. We cannot just let people go into the RTP conversation with no training. If you cannot contextualize a SOTE then you shouldn't be evaluating your colleagues. I say that with all seriousness. If you can't look at 25 SOTES and say, “Wow, three people hammered this person—probably because they didn't like him,” and you can't figure out how to do that then you really need some help. We have got to do this work with intention. We have to look at mandatory training on unconscious bias. We have named it, we've talked about it, and we need to confront it.

We have got to do this work with intention. We need to invite everyone that gets promoted and say, “What is your five-year plan? Where are you going and what do the next steps look like? What are the criteria that are in front of you?” Many people who have talked to me say that the criteria don't match where they want to go and I get that. We have all been there sometimes, but we do have standards set by institutions and you need to understand them. Get all the way up and then you can decide how to change them.

I have had a robust conversation with the deans and I think it needs to go to chairs and school directors. We have a lot of assistant professors coming in who are going to make it to the rank of associate professor if we are consistent, 96% of the time they have been promoted and 40% of our population is in that group in the next five years, that tells you what kind of opportunity we have in front of us to make sure those folks make it to full professor. I do think we need to work on clarity and understand where we are. I'm passionate about this topic. I also know there is a lot of anxiety on the campus and a lot of fear about what is going on. I want to say that we are not just going to name it and walk away. We are going to address it. We will talk about what we need to do. The challenges are across the campus. It starts with how we bring faculty in and then mentor them along the way. I'm incredibly optimistic about this campus. I think the possibilities of what we can do in this place are amazing. These challenges of being promoted from associate to full professor are not unique to San José State University. However, I don't care about anywhere else. I just care about this place.

Questions:

Q: Thank you for your remarks and for the COACHE survey results. This is a little unfair, because you are being picked on about a survey done before you even got here.

(Provost-Yes, it is! Which is OK! Laughter.) One of the things you talked about was recognizing challenges. There are a number of successes reflected in the COACHE survey. There are also a couple things about governance in the survey such as “governance is a shared sense of purpose that is faculty perceptions of actions that foster or undermine relationships between faculty and administration,” and then “faculty perceptions of actions taken by senior leadership as well as how senior leadership engages in shared governance.” Again, this speaks to before you got here.

A: Yes, first, the perception of senior leadership is actually pretty clear in the survey. There are chairs and deans and then everything above that and that is senior leadership. When I presented this to the senior leadership of the campus, I told them they had better own it. We have to own this. There is a great distance between how we operate and that is a problem. The COACHE survey, in my opinion, was intentional to that radical transparency. It is out there. We have a gap so that is the first thing in terms of where we are. It is pretty bold of senior leadership to say we are going to do the survey, but when it shows a gap we are going to acknowledge it. The next step is what do you do about it. That is the big question. To the other point which was shared governance and general initiative, I think the point is we need a dialogue and conversation. I’m trying to be incredibly active as far as the Executive Committee and in being here. There is a very big event happening right now, but my job is to be in the Senate. I’m all for that dialogue. I came here for a number of reasons and not the least of which was to work with the senior leadership team that I like very much. I’ve never been given more flexibility in my job in my entire life. There have been so many times the President has said, “You’re the Provost. Make your decision and figure out how to operate Academic Affairs.” It is really refreshing and really important. Again, I hold an optimism that we can get to the place that turns some of the reds into greens. We need to do the survey again in three years. We need to not just do the survey and not do anything about it. We need to find out how we do. I also think it is open and honest.

Q: Will it be opened up to lecturers in three years as well?

A: I will say that if I had been here last year I would have advocated for lecturers to be included. There are lots of reasons they weren’t. Yes, it is very expensive, and it is a good first cut. However, it is obviously not the whole picture. I think everyone recognized that, but it was at least an opportunity. Like this climate survey, you can see a lot about how senior administration are seen, but the President is going to see it the same day you do. We will all be sitting in the room with you when they present the findings. Those I hope will at least open up the willingness to have a conversation. Again, all of these decisions predate me.

Q: Thanks again for the assurance in terms of these new ideas. Is there any data around the difference in how many women faculty are not going up for promotion to full professor?

A: There are, but I haven’t pulled all of them. I wanted to acknowledge the 74

people, but we haven't done a demographic analysis of that group yet to figure out how many are still in that rank and for how long. In looking casually at the list, it is barely split. However, I don't know exactly how it is split. There is a data course, especially since there are very few Associate Professors, because I got hired in 2000, which was a massive bubble of new hiring, and now we have full professors and assistants and associates are really stuck and they get overburdened in general. That definitely falls differentially. We have to be able to help our colleagues frame themselves in a way that gets through their career right. I apologize for not having those course data, but I can work on it.

Q: Is there particular language to use to switch some of this anxiety?

A: This is a great question. I think if Dr. Wong(Lau) was here she would say moving to mandatory training for all hiring committees this year was a really nice step. Also, having conversations about this data is good also. We have a retention challenge right now probably due to the housing issue. We are going to start doing exit interviews more formally with faculty as well. This will help us tell our story a little better. The diversity of faculty has changed over time. There are conversations about the AS student body as well that we need to talk about. Only three percent of our student body is African-American. However, our local area does not include East Palo Alto, Oakland, or Hayward. If we could recruit actively there, we could probably change the demography of the campus somewhat, but we are not empowered to do so because of the CSU. I also don't think we share our stories well enough. If we did, we would probably create advocates that senior administration talks about. I read all the transcripts out there and Carl was one of the people doing the public hearings on the change to the local area that we were trying to accomplish last year to expand access that were shot down by a narrow margin. That is a collective challenge that senior administration, faculty, staff, and students could all get behind. These are the kinds of things I'm asking of myself as Provost. I think there is a lot of opportunity for us all out there.

Q: I applaud the direction, but I would also encourage the senior administration to consider the associate professors who are department chairs. It is difficult to quantify our contributions within RTP guidelines. It is more difficult in the new guidelines as opposed to the old guidelines. With COACHE, our peer institutions that were chosen do not appear to be very consistent with us in terms of size and whatnot, how were those institutions chosen and can we get information from other institutions more similar to us to compare with?

A: Great question and Carl can talk at length about this. COACHE is a voluntary survey. There are two comparisons. We are compared to every single other COACHE school during that survey year and then we get to pick 5 peers from the campuses filling out the COACHE survey to compare with us. However, there were hardly any other CSUs doing the COACHE survey. Hopefully next time we will get more campuses to do the survey to compare with. This was one of the challenges. A lot of work went into those choices. We hope in three years there is an expanded list

and we can have a larger conversation.

Q: Thank you so much for doing the diversity analysis for promotion. Would you consider doing a diversity audit for the RSCA grants? I think the mentoring is helpful, but many of us aren't suffering from lack of mentoring. It is more structural inequities.

A: Yes, I think we have to look at all of this stuff. We have to look at it in context and in relation. This is why I'm excited about hiring a new Director of Institutional Research and Vice Provost of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics, because we don't have a good understanding of faculty data. I'm all for looking at all these pieces. I have not yet gone through a tenure and promotion cycle as Provost here, so it will be an interesting year as I look at that in relation to the new standards and the way they are written. It does provide some flexibility around the three categories that could produce spaces for some of the things people in this room are talking about. Again, when I sit back and think about this, we could spend the rest of our lives trying to rewrite the RTP guidelines, but what kind of conversation are we having on the front end of the practices that we bring to that, that's the larger issue for me. What are those conversations that are happening? Again, we have to do this with intent and purpose and I'm very committed to that. I think we will get to a place where that will be a part of our regular practice of having those conversations in advance.

Q: So, is that a yes to that?

A: Oh yes, sorry.

Q: The survey of tenure and tenure/track faculty was believed to be phase 1 and phase 2 was going to be this year and was the survey of the lecturer faculty. That needs to happen now, not three years from now. The expectation was that they were going to be surveyed this year. They are a large component and a valuable component and their perspectives shouldn't be overlooked this year and three years from now we will fold them in.

A: I had not heard that. Given the Climate Survey that we are going to launch this year, it would be very difficult to do two this year to be honest. I wouldn't recommend it for someone that is going to do survey work. We have to get to 30 percent to get the results from Rankin. I'm with you. Again, should we do it a year from now or should we wait and do all of it, or should we come up with a different way to talk about some of these issues? Ken and I had a brief conversation about some of the policies when we think about multi-year contracts and other kinds of ways to invest more in lecturers and give them a sense of commitment to their longevity and professional development. I agree with you, but it won't happen this year. If we did the survey next year then we would have one more year before we did the next one. I think we are probably stuck in the cycle we are. That doesn't mean we have to have our feet stuck in the sand waiting for an answer.

Q: The CFA conducted a survey of lecturers last year and had over a 40 percent response rate, would you be interested in seeing it?

A: Yes, absolutely.

Q: I understand that it isn't fair to ask you about the COACHE Survey and what happened before you were here.

A: That's okay, you can ask me.

Q: The COACHE Survey did not include lecturers and is there a reason it was not sent out to all faculty?

A: I actually thought it was. That was probably just a mistake. All the data in on the web and we are not taking it down. I can send out another message. That was an oversight that was not intended. Thank you for pointing that out.

Q: Thank you for your presentation today and for the communication you will be sending out tomorrow. It has been decades since we've had data on our RTP rates, especially data that is available in the categories provided. This has been a subject that Professional Standards has asked numerous administrations for help with. This is the first step of a lot of steps that need to be taken to fix some pretty deep-seated problems that we have here. I'm very encouraged that you are taking that step today. Professional Standards will stand ready to work with you as we discuss matters like mandatory training, specific and intentional mentoring, and programming on unconscious bias. These are all matters that will take a lot of work to implement. If they are going to be implemented in a successful way. So, thank you for initiating a very important conversation that we have needed to look at for a long time.

A: We are not going to undo the systemic challenges in one semester. This is a multi-year project, and the commitment to take up those questions and conversations. This is what the students want. They want mature, sophisticated conversations that reflect on ourselves, so that we can reflect back to them the values they say they want the most. I look forward to working with everyone and trying to figure some of this out. Developing the trust that we can have conversations and we can talk openly about things is key. That means there has to be transparency that we understand what we are talking about collectively. This is not unique to us.

Q: Thank you for your information. I'm dovetailing on Senator Peter's comments about having some information about promotion. I'd specifically like to speak about the associate professors. First, I'd really like to applaud Senator Peter and Professional Standards for creating a RTP policy that we can really look at the three different aspects of a professional career in academics. We have been very fortunate in the Occupational Therapy Department that RSCA release has been given and is a wonderful gift. Yet, we have associate professors that say that they are going to step

up to the plate and say I believe in the institution and take on service responsibility, and then what happens is their RSCA is not valued that highly. The unfortunate thing is that we have these wonderful Associate Professors who have committed themselves to the institution with service in mind. It isn't that their teaching has fallen by the wayside. I'm hopeful that the individual that does take on service can advance to full professor and that that trajectory will be honored.

A: As someone that was an associate professor and chair, I do appreciate the complexities and agree with you. There has to be a way to do this. However, I am going to say something in relation to this that I believe is important for me to say and that is how much service should we be doing as a campus? When you look around and see how much workload we create for ourselves. We don't need to drown ourselves while we are trying to accomplish things. We have to figure out what the right balance is in relation to our overall commitment to the students. I hear committees and how much and for how long they meet and they can go on forever. If someone takes on a responsibility as a Department Chair, should that Associate Professor take on any other service? We have to answer those questions.

C: Some years ago, I proposed a resolution that only full tenured professors be chairs. I was shot down. When I was hired in 1980, I was the first person hired in my department in 17 years. The people who had been here a long, long time had never published anything, because the standards were very different. When I was Senate Chair, one of the things I did was go to New Faculty Orientation. Dennis Jaehne was still Chair of Undergraduate Studies and he came in and talked about aligning your research to the Strategic Plan. I thought, Wow, I wish someone had sat me down when I was a new adjunct and then assistant professor and said, "These are the things you need to be doing and this is the way you should be doing them." Honestly, this was something I had to figure out for myself. I was given administrative responsibilities as an Assistant Professor and one day I went home and said I'm not writing another memo, I'm writing a book and I did. I'm a retired faculty member now so I can speak to this. Having Associate Professors as Department Chairs is not only burdensome for the people who take on those roles, but it is burdensome on the people that are not being mentored by someone who has been through the whole process. I think that it should be mandatory for Department Chairs to be full tenured professors. Secondly, I think you need to have mandatory training for Department Chairs to include how you mentor people. I know being a chair is a nightmare and you are always putting out fires, but personnel is an important area and taking care of people should be your first priority. I also think you need to have mandatory training for Deans. I actually had a faculty member who was appointed as an Assistant Professor, who happened to be an African-American, as an Interim Chair of a fractious department. Mentoring and taking care of people is important. This is a problem for deans to solve. Not a problem for new Assistant Professors to solve.

A: I won't let myself or the leadership team in Academic Affairs off the hook. Conversations have to happen all the way up and down, so I'm with you.

G. Associated Students President:

AS President Parent announced that applications for Student Trustee on the Board of Trustees are due January 8, 2020.

The AS House has been put on the foundation, and hopefully we will be finished soon and can move back in. Half of our departments are still in the SSC and have no windows so they are anxiously awaiting moving back in.

The students on the Senate have had introductions to Course Fee Advisory Committee (CFAC).

AS is helping with promotion and awareness for Census 2020.

AS elections will take place on April 13-15, 2020.

Our new Leadership and Government Coordinator position has been filled.

We are still searching for a new Assistant Executive Director. Hard to get anyone to stay in the position due to cost of housing.

Finals test materials are available from AS for students who need them.

X. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

**Consent Calendar
Academic Senate Meeting
February 10th, 2020**

Add to Committee:	Last/First Name	Zip	Term	Phone	Seat/College
Academic Disq/Reinstatement	Jackson, Melinda	0119	2020	45293	Seat A - Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education, Chair
Accreditation Review Committee	Gleixner, Stacy	0080	2020	43838	Seat A - Faculty member serving as Chair of the Committee; Member of the Steering Committee
Graduate Studies and Research	Chang, Megan	0049	2020	43075	Seat E - Health and Human Sciences
Institutional Review Board	Mattarelli, Elisa	0225	2020	43569	Seat D - Business [one semester/sabbatical leave]
Instruction & Student Affairs	Jackson, Melinda	0119	2020	45293	Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies (Non-Voting)
Instruction & Student Affairs	Martinez, Ernesto	0032	2020	46059	Seat P (General Unit)
International Programs/Students	Jackson, Melinda	0119	2020	45293	Undergraduate Studies Designee (EXO)
International Programs/Students	Dudley, Danijela	0119	2020	45573	Seat Q - College of Social Sciences
Organization and Government	Kao, Katy	0082	2020	43827	Seat I - College of Social Sciences (Faculty-At-Large seat)
Program Planning	Wolcott, Abraham	0099	2022	45449	Seat Q - College of Science
Program Planning	Woodhead, Erin	0070	2022	45654	Seat R - Social Science
Undergraduate Studies	Jackson, Melinda	0119	2020	45293	AVP UGS or Designee (EXO)
University Library Committee	Anderson, Benjamin	0066	2022	43483	Seat G - Business
University Writing Committee	Cabrera, Peggy	0028	2022	82034	Seat I - Faculty, University Library
University Writing Committee	Jackson, Melinda	0119	2020	45293	Vice Provost for UG Education or Designee (EXO)

Remove from Committee:	Last/First Name	Zip	Term	Phone	Seat/College
Instruction & Student Affairs	Johnson, Camille	0070	2020	43551	Seat M - College of Business
Academic Senate	Jackson, Melinda	0119	2022	45293	Senator - College of Social Science
Organization and Government	Jackson, Melinda	0119	2020	45293	Seat I - College of Social Science
International Programs/Students	Haight, Colleen	0030	2020	45422	Undergraduate Studies Designee (EXO)
Undergraduate Studies	Haight, Colleen	0030	2020	45422	AVP UGS or Designee (EXO)
University Writing Committee	Haight, Colleen	0030	2020	45422	Vice Provost for UG Education or Designee (EXO)
Academic Disq/Reinstatement	Haight, Colleen	0030	2020	45422	Seat A (Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education)- Chair
Board of General Studies	Haight, Colleen	0030	2020	45422	Vice Provost for UG Education or Designee (EXO, Non-Voting)

Executive Committee Minutes
December 9, 2019
ADM 167, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Present: Mathur, Shifflett, Curry, Parent, Sullivan-Green, McKee, Frazier, Marachi,
Peter, Wong(Lau), Day, White, Faas
Absent: Papazian, Del Casino

1. The Executive Committee approved the minutes of December 2, 2019 (13-0-0) unanimously.
2. There was no dissent to the Consent Calendar of December 9, 2019.
3. The committee discussed the Senate Retreat. The retreat will focus on Faculty Success. There will be focus groups on faculty innovation and success as well as Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA). Senator Peter and Professor Brent will also present a session on Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility.
4. The Executive Committee discussed Sense of the Senate Resolution, *Celebrating 20 Years of Service Learning at San José State University*. President Papazian and Provost Del Casino discussed changes and Chair Mathur brought those to the Executive Committee for review. Some of the changes include a title change, the information about CCLL is in more of a historical perspective, also the resolution focuses on service-learning and provides recognition to our students, faculty, and community partners.

Senator Peter made a motion to remove the original Sense of the Senate Resolution from the table. The motion was seconded. The Executive Committee vote was unanimous. Senator Peter made a motion to accept the amended version of the Sense of the Senate presented by Chair Mathur. Senator Frazier presented a friendly amendment to add a hyphen between Service-Learning in the title. Senator Frazier presented an amendment to change, “that the university recognizes” in the first three resolved clauses to, “that the university recognize.” Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to remove “CSU Presidents and CSU Senates” from the distribution list. Senator Frazier made a motion to approve the Sense of the Senate as amended. The vote on the amended resolution was unanimous.

5. University Updates:
 - a. CSU Statewide Senate:

There was a meeting in Long Beach on November 13th and 14th, 2019. A memo on Campus Efforts to Fulfill Ethnic Studies was forwarded by Senator Curry to the Senate from the ASCSU Chair. Chancellor White spoke about his decision to retire. He mentioned several things he thought important. The Chancellor hoped full-time positions for contingent faculty

continue to be integrated across the campuses. A question was asked about campus safety. Chancellor White was provided a report about safety on all CSU campuses and it noted that there continues to be serious problems. The Chancellor indicated that safety continues to be a priority for the CSU. The last issue was about the general obligation bond. Also, the Chancellor indicated DACA continues to be important to the CSU and not just for students, but also faculty and staff.

Questions:

Q: Is anything else going to be asked regarding the Ethnic Studies Report that SJSU submitted?

A: Nothing has been asked. There are nine campuses that did not submit any information and the ASCSU is wondering why. Senator Curry will ask and get back to the committee.

Q: I would like to see students and Presidents push for what we want with the legislators.

- b. From the Vice President of Administration and Finance (VPAF):
The steel for the Science Building is going up today and there is a large crane on that spot that is placing steel girders.

SJSU is the recipient of the city Downtown Association's Golden Nail Award for the Spartan Recreation and Aquatic Center.

Questions:

Q: What is going on with the garbage cans at the MLK Library as you walk in? It is dripping inside the front doors.

A: VP Faas was not aware, and he will check into this.

- c. From the AS President:
The deadline for Student Nominations for the Student Trustee to the CSU Board of Trustees is due on January 8, 2019. Student Trustee nominations must be made by the AS President (with interviews with the VP of Student Affairs). The AS House was supposed to be on the foundation by November 25, 2019, but is not complete yet. The AS President will notify the committee when the AS House will reopen.

AS is trying to help with the 2020 Census as best they can and are asking for volunteers.

AS elections will be the second full week of April 2020.

AS just appointed a Leadership Coordinator.

AS is having difficulty getting a new Director, but they keep will keep recruiting.

AS is looking at ways that they can assist with affordable housing on campus.

AS will be giving out free final materials including scantrons, pencils, etc.

Questions:

Q: How many student trustee nominations have you received so far?

A: One.

- d. From the Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA):
News is forthcoming about changes in safety for students on campus. It is complicated and is connected to our enrollment plan.

Fifty-four percent of high school students in California come from low income homes. Affordable housing is very important to us.

Questions for us to consider in enrollment management is what should the balance be between frosh and transfer students? It is highly likely we will have a smaller frosh class in the next five years. There are several things that are in the works that may contribute to smaller numbers, including free community college. Another question we need to think about includes whether we want to enforce first-time students living in housing? These are the type of questions we need to start asking ourselves.

Questions:

Q: It might help to look at what successes and failures other campuses and universities have had?

A: There are all sort of things we need to consider like more online universities/programs. Lots of Universities outside of California are now fishing for students in our backyard. They have amazing marketing. We have some time, but we need to find out what the competition looks like and what the trends are.

Q: What is going on systemwide with respect to this discussion?

A: I'm not sure. The president went to a system meeting and they are having some of those discussions right now. The CSU will approach this as a system, but we need to ask ourselves who we compete with. We need to position ourselves for what is best for SJSU.

- e. From the Chief Diversity Officer (CDO):
CDO Wong and Vice Chair McKee will be charging the Committee on the Professional, Productive, and Ethical Expectations in Work Relations. The group will conduct their work until the end of 2020.

Deanna Fassett is putting together a faculty "Inclusive Teaching" badge process. The CDO is working on something for faculty like "Tip" that includes things like "inclusive pronouns." The CDO has been working on educational opportunities and faculty recruitment trainings for faculty with the colleges of Science and Engineering. College of Engineering also has

some faculty search advocates trained by the CDO's Office who will be working with search committees for their college.

The Campus Climate Survey Committee is about ready to submit the student for IRB approval. The survey dates are Feb. 25th through March 20th, 2019. The CDO will be doing Campus Climate parties with free items to encourage greater participation in the survey.

Questions:

Q: What is going on with internships? Stacy Gleixner stepped in last semester, but it is the end of the semester.

A: Chair Mathur will be talking with Thalia about it.

- f. From the Professional Standards Committee (PS):
PS is grateful for data on last year's tenure and promotion rates and thanks the Provost's office and Faculty Affairs for providing these statistics.

The Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility asked that PS review and update some language in University Policy S14-3 Student Fairness Dispute policy that refers to the work of the board.

The "Banked Time" memo has been posted on the website.

- g. From the Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
The GE Summit is coming up on December 13, 2019. There are about 100 people coming. We have a facilitator from East Bay. C&R will bring a first reading of a replacement policy on increasing flexibility for graduate programs.
- h. From the Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
O&G will have nothing for the Senate this time. O&G is working on the Standing Rules for the first meeting in the spring, and then changes to bylaws.
- i. From the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
First reading of the TOEFL policy. Also I&SA is working on the Syllabus Template review. I&SA may bring the Instructor Drop policy to the Senate at the December 16, 2019 meeting. There will be a group of faculty testing the online Syllabus Template this spring.

- 6. The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

These minutes were taken by the Senate Administrator on December 9, 2019. The minutes were transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on December 9, 2019. The minutes were reviewed by Chair Mathur on January 17, 2020. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on January 27, 2020.

Executive Committee Minutes
January 27, 2020
ADM 167, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Present: Mathur, Shifflett, Curry, Parent, Sullivan-Green, McKee, Frazier, Marachi, Peter, Wong(Lau), Day, White, Faas, Papazian, Del Casino
Absent: None

1. Chair Mathur thanked the GE Summit Committee members including Senator White, Vice Provost Anagnos, Colleen Haight, Melinda Jackson, Kathleen McConnell, the Provost, Executive Assistant to the Provost, Melanie Schlitzkus, Executive Assistant to the VP, Student Affairs, Teri Tanner, the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice and the Senate Student Assistant, Camille Kae Valerio for their support in creating two successful events.
2. The committee discussed and approved amending the Executive Committee agenda to add discussion and approval of a temporary appointment to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) by the Associate Vice Chair (AVC) and add consultation with the Provost on appointing the faculty Chair of the Accreditation Review Committee (ARC).
3. The Executive Committee approved the minutes of December 9, 2019 (15-0-0) unanimously.
4. There was no dissent to the Consent Calendar of January 27, 2020.
5. The committee approved the appointment of Elisa Mattarelli to the IRB. The committee approved the appointment of Stacy Gleixner as the faculty chair of the ARC.
6. Updates:
 - a. From the President:

The President discussed the Comprehensive Housing Plan announced at the press conference. This plan is meant to meet the long-term needs of faculty and staff and to address student housing insecurity. The Alquist Building was part of the state's review of unused space and SJSU has been given the opportunity to partner with the city and state on this project. Once built, the new building will include 800 to 1,200 units for use by faculty, staff, graduate students, and undergraduate students with families. The President noted there were so many people who worked on this behind the scenes and gave her thanks to members of the cabinet, legislators, and students. Many positives emerged from the press conference including that the Mayor called SJSU an "anchor institution" in downtown San José for the first time.

Questions/Comments:

Q: Since VTA has changed their bus schedule and eliminated lots of the downtown buses, there is an issue for people with mobility issues. No buses go

within 2 blocks of campus. Many of us don't use BART and need the buses. Are there any plans to address this?

A: Cindy Chavez was just appointed to be the new Board Chair of the VTA and she is an SJSU alum, so we hope to reach out to her to address some of these issues. There may also come a time when the President will request faculty, staff, and students to testify before the VTA board.

Q: What about having shuttle buses to campus from the train station?

A: This may be a possibility, but the shuttles are busy coming from the Park & Ride Lot. We will look into it. The Rapid 500 may be a solution, but it is not open yet.

Q: The buses only come every 15 minutes and are not close to the campus, so it is also an accessibility issue. Dash used to run every 6 or 7 minutes.

A: It is a real issue and we will continue to look for reasonable alternatives.

Q: How much below market value will the faculty, staff, and graduate student housing be?

A: The state has specific rules regarding the building. However, if you take away the cost of the land that allows us provide more affordable housing.

Q: What is the timeline?

A: First, we will study the space to see what we can be done in terms of building. Then, the existing building will be torn down and rebuilt. The timeline is most likely 2025. We will take 1 to 1 ½ years to study and draw up plans and 3 years to build it.

Q: What is the status of the VP, University Advancement search?

A: We are extending the search to widen the pool.

Q: Who is running Advancement as Peter Smits interim position ended in December? We are in the silent phase of the Comprehensive Campaign and this is a critical fundraising period in terms of the base target goals.

A: We are moving forward with the campaign and we have a strong development team. Peter is providing support with the Phoenix Philanthropy Group.

Q: Deans and other units presented their plans for funding and priorities, how was this information used?

A: There is a preliminary plan, Phoenix Philanthropy Group has been meeting with about 50 people over the last two weeks to gather feedback on funding priorities.

b. From the Curriculum and Research Committee:

The GE Summit was productive and well attended. Day 1 was held on 12/13/19 and Day 2 on 1/24/20. C&R received lots of feedback on GE learning outcomes. C&R will be bringing updates to the GE Guidelines. C&R may seek additional input and meet with various groups. There is also movement on the systemwide ethnic studies requirement again.

In the current revision of the GE learning outcomes, there are thirteen Program Learning Outcomes (PLO). Concerns were noted about the number of PLOs. Specific Areas (A, D, E) need some additional discussion and feedback. Area D is also in the Presidential Directive. The Provost encouraged C&R to go from 13 to 7 PLOs. There was lots of feedback on the PLOs. San Francisco only assesses what WASC requires which is five PLOs, linked to the core competencies. EO 1065 allows a separate element to do assessment.

C&R hopes to have an update on the guidelines for the Senate by the end of the semester. Today C&R will discuss the feedback from the Senate from the December senate meeting regarding undergraduate students taking graduate courses.

- c. From the Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
O&G will be bringing a revision to the standing rules at the first Senate meeting on February 10, 2020. O&G is also working on bylaw updates.
- d. From the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (IS&A):
I&SA will be bringing back two of the first reading items from the December meeting as final readings at the February 10, 2020 Senate meeting. I&SA will also be working on three new referrals and after that will work on the 5 left from the 20 referrals from O&G last year.

I&SA will also be doing a referral to O&G to reduce the size of I&SA from 21 people to something more manageable.

- e. From the Professional Standards Committee (PS):
PS is working on revising the teaching descriptor in the RTP policy. PS has a new policy amendment to add RTP procedures for the College of Professional and Graduate Education (CPGE).

PS will be working on revising the Lecturer Evaluation Policy and possibly establish a new title of "Senior Lecturer."

- f. From the CSU Statewide Senator:
The ASCSU discussed the affordable housing issue as well as wage adjustments. The ASCSU further discussed relations between faculty and administrators.

CSU Los Angeles has established an Ethnic Studies College.

Trustee Jane Carney visited and stayed for the plenary meeting. The ASCSU asked for greater support for the CSU. They also discussed the role of the trustees in selecting campus leadership. Faculty are upset they have less impact in the selection process than in the past.

Trustee Carney asked about the new Chancellor position. People have indicated they want a more “humanistic” chancellor.

The ASCSU passed three resolutions. The first resolution was on how to notify contingent faculty of openings. The second resolution was to advance equity, diversity, and inclusion in the ASCSU. This resolution was to ensure that the ASCSU operates by creating a holistic, humane environment for its senators. The last resolution was regarding the apportionment of senators for each campus.

The ASCSU discussed AS 3403, the system-wide Ethnic Studies requirement. There are a variety of issues in relations to EO 1100. There are a lot of issues regarding Ethnic Studies in terms of lower-division and upper-division curricular requirements. There was some adverse reaction to Dr. Weber regarding AB 1460 and concern was noted regarding the rhetoric around speaking about her.

Questions:

Q: Have we given up on fighting AB 1460? We need to ensure that we continue to fight as far as possible with regard to the legislative intrusion on curriculum. Once that door is opened, we will not be able to close it.

A: It is important to lead with actual data and what is happening on our campus. We need to continue to make ethnic studies a healthy and vibrant part of our curriculum.

C: Our Senate has sent data, comments, reports regarding ethnic studies. It is clear we support ethnic studies, but not the legislative input on curriculum. C: On other campuses the faculty are divided about their responses.

C: The Chief Diversity Officers are split on this.

C: There needs to be a powerful presentation given to the trustees about legislative control over curriculum.

The meeting adjourned at 1:33 p.m.

These minutes were taken by the Senate Administrator on January 27, 2020. The minutes were transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on January 31, 2020. The minutes were reviewed by Chair Mathur on January 31, 2020. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on February 3, 2020.

1 San Jose State University
2 Academic Senate
3 Instruction and Student Affairs
4 February 10, 2020
5 Final Reading

AS 1741

6 **Policy Recommendation: English Language Proficiency**
7 **Requirement for SJSU Applicants**

8 **Rescinds and Replaces University Policy F75-6**

9 **Legislative History:** The Academic Senate at its meeting of November 24, 1975,
10 passed F75-6 as a resolution on the TOEFL requirement for applicants who were
11 neither citizens educated in the U.S. nor “foreign” students. The specific student group
12 targeted in this policy was called “Resident Aliens,” i.e., permanent residents granted an
13 immigration visa. Because a permanent resident was not required to present evidence
14 of English proficiency, such a student was often admitted to the University without proof
15 of adequate language skills to succeed in their academic program. Therefore, it was
16 resolved that permanent residents who graduated from a “foreign” high school be
17 required to achieve a minimum score of 500 on the TOEFL and further resolved that this
18 requirement may be waived in the Admissions Office if the applicant met certain well
19 defined criteria indicating English language proficiency.
20

21 **Whereas:** Having a strong understanding of the English language is important for
22 success at SJSU, and

23 **Whereas:** It is important to demonstrate evidence of language proficiency prior to
24 being admitted into the University, and

25 **Whereas:** The language in F75-6 is outdated, and

26 **Whereas:** F75-6 was specific to permanent residents only, and

27 **Whereas:** F75-6 makes reference to citizenship status which is irrelevant, and

28 **Whereas:** F75-6 does not mention any English Proficiency Tests other than TOEFL,
29 and

30 **Whereas:** F75-6 does not concur with Sections 40752.1, 40802.1, and 41040 of Title
31 5 of the California Code of Regulations specifying the CSU English
32 language requirements for applicants or Executive Order 975: Policy
33 Governing the English Language Examination
34 (<https://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-975.html>), therefore be it

35

36 **Resolved:** That University Policy F75-6 be rescinded and replaced with the following.

37 **Approved:** January 27, 2020
38 **Vote:** 14-0-0
39 **Present:** Delgadillo, Honda (non-voting), Jackson (non-voting),
40 Khan, Kim, Kitajima, Parent, Rollerson, Roque, Sen,
41 Sullivan-Green, Trang, Walters, Wilson, Wolcott, Yao
42 **Absent:** Hill, Sorkhabi
43 **Financial Impact:** None
44 **Workload Impact:** None
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66

67 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**

68 **English Language Proficiency Requirement for SJSU applicants**

69
70 Undergraduate Students:

71
72 The following undergraduate applicants (including transfer applicants) are required to
73 submit a score of 500 or above on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL)
74 to the Office of Undergraduate Admissions:

- 75
- 76 • Who have graduated from a secondary or high school in a country where English
- 77 is not a primary language and
- 78
- 79 • Who have not attended school at the secondary level or above for at least 3
- 80 years full time where English is the principal language of instruction
- 81

82 Some majors may require a score higher than the campus minimum. Alternative
83 methods, such as the International English Language Testing System (IELTS), Pearson
84 Test of English (PTE), or other comparable tests assessing English fluency may also be
85 used.

86
87 Post-baccalaureate and Graduate Students:

88
89 The following post-baccalaureate or graduate applicants are required to submit a score
90 of 550 or above on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) to the Office of
91 Graduate Admissions:

- 92
- 93 • Who come from a country where English is not a primary language and
- 94
- 95 • Who do not possess a baccalaureate degree from a post-secondary institution
- 96 where English is the principal language of instruction.
- 97

98 Some majors may require a score higher than the campus minimum. Alternative
99 methods, such as the International English Language Testing System (IELTS), Pearson
100 Test of English (PTE), or other comparable tests assessing English fluency may also be
101 used.

102
103 This requirement may be waived in the Offices of Undergraduate Admissions and
104 Graduate Admissions and Program Evaluations if the applicant meets one or more of
105 the following criteria:

- 106
- 107 1. The applicant has completed three years or more of study at a secondary
- 108 or high school in the U.S.
- 109
- 110 2. The applicant has completed 72 semester/108 quarter transferable units
- 111 at an accredited college or university in the U.S.

112
113
114
115
116
117
118

3. The applicant has studied full-time at a U.S. college or university for at least three years.
4. The department graduate admissions representative requests that a waiver be granted after consultation with the College of Graduate Studies to assess English language proficiency.

6
7
8
9 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
10 **Amendment B to University Policy S15-8**
11 **Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees:**
12 **Criteria and Standards**

13
14
15 Resolved: That S15-8 be amended as shown in the ~~strikeout~~ and underline of the
16 excerpted policy.

17
18 Rationale: Professional Standards has become aware of several limitations in the
19 “baseline” teaching descriptor of our RTP policy. This descriptor sets the
20 minimum standards in teaching expected for tenure.

21
22 The main purpose of our amendment is to achieve the policy’s original intent
23 that teaching be evaluated holistically and fairly, using multiple sources of
24 information, including but not limited to the Student Opinion of Teaching
25 Effectiveness surveys (SOTES.)

26
27 First, our revised language seeks to correct a problem with the way the
28 current language discusses the “norms” of our SOTES. As one example of
29 the problem, it is sometimes the case that a SOTE evaluation of 4.0 is
30 “below the norm” as set by the Student Evaluation Review Board, even
31 though the SOTE instrument states that a “4” means that the student agrees
32 that the instructor is “effective.” Thus, faculty who are judged to be
33 “effective” by their students are sometimes judged to be “below the norm”
34 with important negative consequences for their professional advancement.
35 Our proposed language corrects this problem by providing needed flexibility,
36 indicating that the survey results, “are considered supportive if they are
37 either within appropriate norms, or if a preponderance of student opinion
38 from objective and subjective questions indicates effective teaching.”

39
40 The committee also inserted a reference to “course syllabi and other
41 teaching materials.” These materials are already commonly present in
42 dossiers, but the explicit inclusion of this language reminds evaluators that
43 information beyond the SOTES must also be considered.
44
45
46
47
48

49
50 Approved: December 10, 2019
51 Vote: 10-0-0
52 Present: He, Cargill, Peter, Monday, Kumar, Mahendra, Kemnitz, Birrer, Chin,
53 Riley
54 Absent: None
55 Financial Impact: No direct impact
56 Workload Impact: No direct impact
57

58 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**

59 **Amending S15-8**

60 **University Policy, Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees:**
61 **Criteria and Standards**

62
63

64
65 ~~3.3.1.3.2 Baseline. The candidate has taught assigned courses that are well crafted and~~
66 ~~appropriate for the catalog description. The candidate has taken measures to~~
67 ~~correct any problems identified earlier in either direct observations or prior~~
68 ~~performance evaluations. Recent direct observations are supportive. Student~~
69 ~~evaluations, taking into account the nature, subject, and level of classes taught,~~
70 ~~generally within the norms by the end of the review period, particularly for~~
71 ~~classes within the candidate's primary focus and any curriculum specifically~~
72 ~~identified in the appointment letter.—~~

73
74 3.3.1.3.2 Baseline. The candidate has documented effectiveness in teaching, particularly
75 for classes within the candidate's primary focus and any curriculum specifically
76 identified in the appointment letter. Assigned courses are well crafted and
77 appropriate for the catalog description, as shown in course syllabi and other
78 teaching materials. The candidate has taken measures to correct any problems
79 identified earlier in either direct observations or prior performance evaluations.
80 Recent direct observations and surveys of student opinion of teaching
81 effectiveness (SOTEs) are also supportive. SOTEs are considered supportive
82 if they are either within appropriate norms, or if a preponderance of student
83 opinion from objective and subjective questions indicates effective teaching.

84
85

1 San Jose State University
2 Academic Senate
3 Instruction and Student Affairs
4 February 10, 2020
5 Final Reading

AS 1759

6 **Policy Recommendation**

7 **Students’ Rights to Timely Feedback on Class Assignments**

8 **Rescinds and Replaces University Policy F13-1**

9 **Effective: Fall 2020**

10 **Legislative History:** F13-1 was adopted in Fall 2013 in response to concerns that
11 grading policies were fragmented and did not include expectations for feedback to
12 students on assignments. The policy was meant to be temporary until a comprehensive
13 grading policy was created. In Fall 2018, the Academic Senate approved F18-5, which
14 incorporated a majority of grading policies related to final course grades; However, F18-
15 5 did not include language relating to student feedback.

16
17 **Whereas:** F13-1 was meant to be a temporary policy until such time as an omnibus
18 revision of grading policies and procedures was passed, and

19
20 **Whereas:** A number of policies have been enacted encompassing grading issues,
21 but have specifically excluded students’ rights to timely feedback on class
22 assignments, and

23
24 **Whereas:** Faculty have a responsibility to provide timely feedback to students
25 regarding their work, therefore be it

26
27 **Resolved:** That F13-1 be rescinded and be replaced with the following.

28
29 **Approved:** February 2, 2020.

30 **Vote:** 12-0-0.

31 **Present:** Delgadillo, Honda (non-voting), Jackson (non-voting), Khan, Kim,
32 Kitajima, Parent, Roque, Sen, Sullivan-Green, Tran, Wilson, Wolcott,
33 Yao.

34 **Absent:** Hill, Honda, Rollerson, Sorkhabi, Walters.

35 **Financial Impact:** Small amount of work to the faculty to adjust their assignment
36 schedules.

37 **Workload Impact:** None.

40

41

42

43

POLICY RECOMMENDATION

44

Students' Right to Timely Feedback on Class Assignments

45

46 Feedback on an assignment is a student's right. Timely feedback enables a student to
47 successfully progress in and complete a course; therefore, faculty should provide
48 feedback in a timely manner. When assigning student work, faculty should indicate the
49 expected timeframe when feedback will be provided, and if a delay occurs, students
50 should be notified of the new expected timeframe. When feedback on an assignment
51 affects performance on subsequent assignment(s), the due date for the subsequent
52 assignment(s) should enable students to maximize their performance on the
53 assignment(s).

54

6 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**

7 **Graduate Credit Earned by SJSU Undergraduate Students**

8 **Rescinds and Replaces University Policy S89-2**

9 **Whereas:** University Policy S89-2 was developed to provide guidance on how
10 undergraduate students may earn graduate credit while still an
11 undergraduate student, and

12 **Whereas:** Any SJSU undergraduate student may take a graduate level course at
13 SJSU provided that they meet the course prerequisites, and

14 **Whereas:** If an SJSU undergraduate student takes a graduate level course, then that
15 graduate level course is listed in the student's undergraduate transcript
16 regardless if the course is applied to the undergraduate degree or not, and

17 **Whereas:** There is a benefit to having the transcript clearly indicate whether a
18 graduate level course taken by an SJSU undergraduate student is applied
19 to the undergraduate degree or is available for use as graduate credit, and

20 **Whereas:** University Policy S89-2 unnecessarily restricts SJSU undergraduate
21 students from earning the number of graduate units permissible by Title 5
22 Section 40510 for transfer into a graduate program, therefore be it

23 **Resolved:** That S89-2 be rescinded effectively immediately and the new policy
24 described below be approved.

25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32

POLICY RECOMMENDATION

33

Graduate Credit Earned by SJSU Undergraduate Students

34

1. Undergraduate students shall petition through their major advisor to earn graduate credit for a graduate course taken.

35

36

37

2. Undergraduate students shall meet the following criteria before enrolling in graduate level courses for graduate credit:

38

39

40

a. will have applied to graduate from their baccalaureate degree program prior to enrolling in graduate level courses

41

42

b. No more than 30 units are needed to complete the baccalaureate degree at San José State University;

43

44

c. None of the courses to be taken for graduate credit is required for the baccalaureate degree or minor;

45

46

d. A grade point average of 2.75 or better on all work completed in upper division standing at San José State University;

47

48

e. A maximum of 16 units is attempted in the semester in which the courses for graduate credit are proposed.

49

50

51

3. Graduate credit will appear on the student's official transcript, but that credit does not imply admission to any graduate degree program.

52

53

54

4. The student may not elect to take letter-graded graduate courses as CR/NC when graduate credit is requested.

55

56

57

5. If a student is admitted to an SJSU graduate degree program, the maximum graduate credit earned through the process described herein that may be transferred into the graduate program is limited to 30% of the total units of the graduate degree (per University Policy S13-8) and must be approved by the appropriate program authority.

58

59

60

61

62

Approved: February 3, 2020

63

Vote: 11-0-0

64

Present: Anagnos, Coelho, d'Alarcao, Khavul, Kaur, Lombardi, Maffini, Masegian, Schultz-Krohn, Stacks, White

65

66

Absent: Hart, Ramasubramanian

67

Workload Impact: None anticipated

68

Financial Impact: None anticipated

6
7 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
8 **Amendment B to University Policy S15-7**
9 **Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees:**
10 **Procedures Concerning Small Colleges**

11
12
13 **Resolved:** That S15-7 be amended as shown in the ~~strikeout~~ and underline of the
14 excerpted policy.

15
16 **Rationale:** The existing RTP policy explicitly excludes the College of International and
17 Extended Studies from the RTP process, since at the time of the creation of
18 that policy, CIES lacked any faculty. In 2019 that college was renamed
19 College of Professional and Global Education, and the faculty of the School
20 of Information were moved into the new college. The RTP policy
21 consequently needs to be revised to provide the faculty of the new college
22 normal representation and participation in the RTP system.

23
24 This new college is at present very small, with two academic departments
25 and 16 t/tt faculty listed on the IEA website. To assure that the faculty of the
26 new college receive comparable reviews to the faculty of all other colleges,
27 this amendment establishes that all college RTP committees represent a
28 minimum of three academic departments, electing representatives from
29 related disciplines outside the college if necessary to augment their
30 membership.

31
32 The new college becomes entitled by policy to elect a representative to the
33 University RTP committee.

34
35 **Approved:** February 3, 2020.

36 **Vote:** 9-0-0

37 **Present:** He, Cargill, Peter, Monday, Kumar, Mahendra, Kemnitz, Birrer, Chin

38 **Absent:** Riley

39
40 **Financial Impact:** Electing an additional member to the University RTP committee will
41 require additional assigned time to support this member.

42
43 **Workload Impact:** No direct impact

45
46 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
47 **Amendment B to University Policy S15-7**
48 **Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees:**
49 **Procedures**
50 **Concerning Small Colleges**
51

52

53
54 1.2 When this document refers to colleges it means those colleges that administer
55 departments which are home to Unit 3 tenure/tenure track faculty. ~~This excludes the College~~
56 ~~of International and Extended Studies.~~

57

58
59 3.3 College Level Review

60 3.3.1 The college retention, tenure, and promotion committee shall be composed of
61 tenured full professors. ~~from departments within the college or, if augmentation~~
62 ~~is required, from related disciplines outside the college, and shall be elected~~
63 College committees shall provide the opportunity for representation from each
64 department in the college, and will represent a minimum of three departments.
65 Colleges with fewer than three departments, or otherwise in need of
66 augmenting their committee, will elect faculty from related disciplines outside
67 the college. Election shall be by the probationary and tenured faculty unit
68 employees of each department. Each college shall determine the number to be
69 elected from each department and the minimum size required for department
70 representation on the college committee. Department chairs and faculty serving
71 on a college committee may not serve on a departmental committee in that
72 college or on the university committee. The college committee shall elect its
73 own chair and prepare its own report.

74

1 **San José State University**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Organization and Government Committee**
4 **February 10, 2020**
5 **Final Reading**

AS 1762

6
7 **Policy Recommendation**
8 **Modifying Seats on the Program Planning Committee and the**
9 **Accreditation Review Committee**
10 **Amendment B to University Policy S17-11;**
11 **and Amendment B to University Policy S16-5**
12

13 Legislative History: The membership information for the Program Planning Committee
14 resides in S17-11. The membership information for the Accreditation Review Committee
15 resides in S16-5. This proposal would have the representative from Institutional
16 Effectiveness and Strategic Analytics be the Director of Institutional Research or
17 designee for these Committees.

18
19 **Whereas:** In the fall 2019, the Provost and Senior Vice President Vin Del Casino
20 presented the senate with a reorganization chart for the division he
21 oversees, Academic Affairs, and
22

23 **Whereas:** Within this organizational chart he noted that he has re-envisioned how
24 the office formerly known as Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics will
25 be organized, and
26

27 **Whereas:** The department now known as “Institutional Research” is where the
28 Director of Institutional Research is housed and this is the position that is
29 most closely aligned with our former position, Director of Institutional
30 Effectiveness and Analytics (IEA), therefore be it
31

32 **Resolved:** That S17-11, and S16-5 be amended by replacing the seats formerly
33 assigned to the IEA Director with the Director of Institutional Research as
34 noted on the following pages.
35

36 **Rationale:** The change appropriately provides the committees with the person best
37 able to support the work of these committees. In addition, it is useful to
38 include ‘or designee’ for the seats, as this provides flexibility to the
39 managers in this unit within Academic Affairs.
40

41 **Approved:** 2/3/20

42 **Vote:** 7-1-0

43 **Present:** Altura, French, Grosvenor, Millora, Okamoto,
44 Shifflett, Gallo, McClory

45 **Absent:** Higgins

46 Financial Impact: None
47 Workload Impact: None
48
49
50 Proposed changes
51
52 For S17-11; Amendment B; Update information on membership for Program Planning
53 Committee to read:
54
55 Membership
56 Office of the Provost
57 Office of AVP Undergrad Studies
58 Office of AVP Research
59 ~~Office of Dir IEA~~ Director of Institutional Research or designee
60 Director of Assessment
61 2 Faculty, Business
62 2 Faculty, Education
63 2 Faculty, Engineering
64 2 Faculty, Health and Human Sciences
65 2 Faculty, Humanities and the Arts
66 2 Faculty, Science
67 2 Faculty, Social Science
68 2 Members, General Unit
69 Staff member (Non-Voting)
70 1 Graduate Student
71 1 Undergraduate Student
72
73 For S16-5; Amendment B; Update information for the Accreditation Review Committee
74 to read:
75
76 Membership:
77 A faculty member serving as chair of the review committee
78 5 faculty-at-Large
79 1 Department Chair
80 Chair of the Academic Senate (or designee) [EXO]
81 Faculty Director of Assessment [EXO]
82 Program Planning Committee Chair [EXO]
83 Provost (or designee) [EXO]
84 2 members of the President's cabinet
85 1 staff member from Academic Affairs
86 1 staff member from Student Affairs
87 1 dean from one of the seven academic colleges
88 AVP, Graduate and Undergraduate Programs (WSCUC Accreditation Liaison
89 Officer) [EXO]
90 Institutional Research Director or designee, ~~Office of Institutional Effectiveness and~~
91 ~~Analytics~~ [EXO]

- 92 The President of Associated Students or designee [EXO]
- 93 A member of the community, appointed by the President

1 San José State University
2 Academic Senate
3 Organization and Government Committee
4 February 10, 2020
5 First Reading
6

AS 1763

7 **Senate Management Resolution**
8 **Update of Senate Standing Rules**
9

10
11 Whereas: The Organization and Government Committee has completed its review of
12 Senate Standing Rules, and
13

14 Whereas: Areas in need of update were found, therefore be it

15
16 Resolved: That the attached updates be adopted once passed by the Senate.
17

18
19 Rationale: The updates proposed address areas where issues related to compliance
20 had been noted and where the work of the Senate could be facilitated.
21

22
23
24
25 Approved: January 27, 2020

26 Vote: 7-0-0

27 Present: Altura, Grosvenor, Millora, Okamoto, Shifflett, Gallo, McClory

28 Absent: Higgins, French

29 Financial Impact: Potentially a reduction in costs with predominantly electronic
30 communications.

31 Workload Impact: Additional coordination between the Senate Chair and policy
32 committee chairs to facilitate communication on outstanding items.
33

34

35

Recommended Updates to Senate Standing Rules

Add a new Section 4 (and update all subsequent numbering) on Communications:

4. Senate communications to all individuals and groups will typically be electronic unless an accommodation is requested.

Section ~~5~~ 6: Whenever possible, each member of the Academic Senate shall be supplied with an electronic copy of any item presented to the Senate for action. On each such item, the date and source shall be indicated.

Section ~~6~~ 7: Submission of agenda items:

- a) Items for inclusion on the agenda must be presented in writing to the Academic Senate office ~~at least one week~~ by Tuesday prior to a scheduled meeting.
- b) During Senate meetings, senators are encouraged to submit particularly lengthy amendments ~~in writing~~ electronically to the AVC. ~~The Academic Senate office shall make a form available for this purpose at each meeting.~~

Section ~~7~~ 8, a, I: Call to Order and Roll Call (as needed)

Section ~~7~~ 8, a, IX: State of the University Announcements. Questions. In rotation. ~~(Detailed Reports/announcements, if necessary, are encouraged to be submitted in writing or by email~~ electronically and included with the agenda when possible.)

- A. Provost
- B. Vice President for Administration and Finance
- C. Vice President for Student Affairs
- D. Chief Diversity Officer
- E. CSU Senators Senate Liaison
- F. Associated Students President

Section ~~10~~ 11, b: Recommendations from policy ~~standing~~ committees, whether or not they affect any university policy, may be acted upon at the meeting of the Academic Senate at which they are introduced, provided they have been distributed to members of the Senate at least twenty-four (24) hours in advance of the meeting. However, a recommendation which a committee considers of unusual importance or complexity may be designated by the committee as a "first reading" item, for final action at the meeting following that at which it was first reported by the committee.

Section ~~12~~ 13: Minutes

- a) Minutes of the Academic Senate will be posted electronically within one week of the Senate meeting. ~~are available to anyone in the academic community upon request.~~

Section ~~17~~ 18, f: When possible, voting in Senate committees should be done in person during committee meetings. However, at the discretion of the chair, Senate committees

82 shall be permitted to conduct votes via electronic mail, unless at least one committee
83 member objects to email voting on a particular issue. Email voting shall not be used as
84 a substitute for in-person deliberation and debate, and shall only be conducted after a
85 proposal has been discussed in committee. If no member objects to email voting, the
86 committee chair shall be responsible for transmitting the proposal to be voted on and for
87 establishing a reasonable voting deadline. The committee chair must also tabulate and
88 report the results of voting to the committee members in a timely fashion. ~~indicating the~~
89 ~~votes of individual members. Committee members who do not have access to email~~
90 ~~shall be notified of all votes and shall be permitted to cast a vote in some other fashion.~~
91 At least a majority of the entire committee membership must vote before a vote can be
92 considered valid. If a vote is taken via email, that fact should be noted in any committee
93 documentation that results from the vote (e.g. meeting minutes, annual reports, policy
94 recommendations, etc.).

95
96 Section 47 ~~18~~, g, 4: ~~Operating Committees, Special Committees, All other Committees:~~
97 Members of other ~~operating committees, special agencies, 'other,' and special~~
98 committees are expected to attend meetings in person. At the discretion of the
99 committee chair, remote attendance may be permitted when appropriate and reliable
100 resources are available and the work of the committee will not be compromised. The
101 individual requesting remote attendance is responsible for making all necessary
102 arrangement needed to facilitate remote attendance.

103
104 Section 48 ~~19~~, a: The Chair shall oversee the Senate's policy formulation process,
105 shall take care that Senate policies are periodically reviewed and that appropriate
106 revisions are initiated, shall, prior to the conclusion of the academic year, provide each
107 policy committee chair with a record of all outstanding items to facilitate preparation of
108 committee year-end reports, shall cooperate with the incoming Chair to assure an
109 orderly transition, shall be the Senate's principal spokesperson, and shall supervise the
110 operations and activities of the Senate office;
111