

**SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE**

**2016/2017**

**Agenda**

**February 13, 2017, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm**

**Engineering 285/287**

- I. **Call to Order and Roll Call:**
- II. **Approval of Minutes:**  
**Senate Minutes of December 12, 2016**
- III. **Communications and Questions:**
  - A. From the Chair of the Senate
  - B. From the President
- IV. **State of the University Announcements:**
  - A. Vice President for Student Affairs
  - B. Associated Students President
  - C. Vice President for University Advancement
  - D. Statewide Academic Senators
  - E. Provost
  - F. Vice President for Administration and Finance
- V. **Executive Committee Report:**
  - A. Minutes of the Executive Committee –  
**Executive Committee Minutes of November 28, 2016**  
**Executive Committee Minutes of December 5, 2016**  
**Executive Committee Minutes of January 11, 2017**  
**Executive Committee Minutes of January 30, 2017**
  - B. Consent Calendar –  
**Consent Calendar of February 13, 2017**
  - C. Executive Committee Action Items –  
**Senate Calendar for 2017-2018**
- VI. **New Business:**
  - A. Strategic Planning Discussion
- VII. **Unfinished Business:**
- VIII. **Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation)**
  - A. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):  
***AS 1644, Policy Recommendation, Final Examinations, Evaluations,  
or Culminating Activities Policy (Final Reading)***

B. Professional Standards Committee (PS):  
***AS 1633, Policy Recommendation, Adopting New SOTE and SOLATE Instruments (Final Reading)***

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

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

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

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

D. University Library Board (ULB):

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

**IX. Special Committee Reports:**

**X. Adjournment:**

2016/2017 Academic Senate

MINUTES  
December 12, 2016

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

**Ex Officio:**

Present: Kimbarow, Van Selst, Lee,  
Pérea, Sabalius  
Absent: None

**CASA Representatives:**

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

**Administrative Representatives:**

Present: Faas, Blaylock, Feinstein  
Absent: Papazian

**COB Representatives:**

Present: Reade, Rodan, Campsey  
Absent: None

**Deans:**

Present: Stacks, Jacobs, Schutten  
Absent: Green

**EDUC Representatives:**

Present: Laker, Mathur  
Absent: None

**Students:**

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

**ENGR Representatives:**

Present: Chung, Sullivan-Green  
Absent: Hamed-Hagh

**Alumni Representative:**

Present: Walters  
Absent: None

**H&A Representatives:**

Present: Frazier, Grindstaff,  
Riley, Miller, Khan  
Absent: Ormsbee

**Emeritus Representative:**

Present: Buzanski  
Absent: None

**SCI Representatives:**

Present: White, Cargill, Boekema  
Absent: Kaufman

**Honorary Representative:**

Present: None  
Absent: Lessow-Hurley

**SOS Representatives:**

Present: Peter, Wilson, Curry  
Absent: Trulio, Hart

**General Unit Representatives:**

Present: Matoush, Higgins, Trousdale,  
Kauppila  
Absent: None

**II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–**

The minutes of November 21, 2016 were approved as amended by Senator Sabalius (45-0-0).

**III. Communications and Questions –**

**A. From the Chair of the Senate—**

Chair Kimbarow thanked the Senators and members of the Executive Committee for their support and hard work this year.

The constitutional amendment to remove the VP of University Advancement from

the Senate was approved by the faculty in a campus-wide vote (108-8-1). This amendment will now be sent to the President for signature.

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

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

**B. From the President—No report.**

**IV. Executive Committee Report –**

**A. Executive Committee Minutes –**

EC Minutes of November 14, 2016 – No questions.

**B. Consent Calendar –**

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

**C. Executive Committee Action Items:**

**V. New Business – None**

**VI. Unfinished Business: None**

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

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

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

---

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

Questions:

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

A: O&G is confident that we have moved this from an original draft to a place where

it can be implemented and confident this is a good time for a final reading.

Q: On line 28, how large a resource are we talking about, who will provide the resource, and does the university have sufficient funds to provide the resource?

A: This calls for the administration in consultation with the Senate to investigate the options. There are some financially-feasible options. There are some non-subscription-based options as well that are well within our means.

Q: In section 5.1, it says department chairs have full voting rights in the department as long as they are chair, then in section 5.2 it says faculty assigned as interim or acting chair for a department do not have full voting rights in that department is that correct?

A: If you are looking at the grey sheet with modifications there may be a mistake. The intent is that the interim/acting chair has full voting rights in the department they chair and their home department.

**Debate:**

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

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

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

**[AS 1621 was referred back to the committee with instructions.]**

---

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

For 20 years the Senate has elected Chairs for one year and then re-elected him/her to

serve a second year. This proposal would make the chair's term an elected 2-year term and would provide stability to the Senate Office, strengthen the position of the Chair, and also allow sufficient time for the Senate Chair to learn the multitude of tasks involved in leading the Senate.

**Questions:**

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

A: We do have the ability to remove the Senate Chair from their position.

Q: Would the committee consider having the Vice Chair term still be a 1-year renewable term?

A: Interesting. The committee did not discuss this.

**Debate:**

Comments:

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

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

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

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

---

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1642, Policy Recommendation, Change in Membership and Charge of the Student Success Committee (First Reading)*.

This change would reconstitute the Student Success Committee as a special agency, reduce the membership from 20 to 11, and give the group a more action-oriented role.

**Questions:**

Q: Could you please clarify what this means operationally, because now you are moving the Student Success Committee out from under the policy committees and making it a special agency?

A: Even though it is changed to a special agency it could still report to the I&SA Committee. Everything about a special agency is dictated by the policy that brought them into being. We can make sure that the reporting line to I&SA stays in place.

Q: Why is the committee membership mainly administrators and staff with very few faculty, when faculty are in charge of student success on campus?

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

Q: Has the committee thought about having a smaller subset of the committee become the policy drafting committee? That way the policy recommendation might remain in a majority of faculty control?

A: I'm a big fan of this. This committee can split off subgroups as needed.

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

A: The committee will consider it.

Q: Has the committee consulted with the UCCD on the charge?

A: No, not yet. I will take this back to the committee.

Q: Will the AS representative still serve on this committee?

A: AS makes recommendations for students to serve on policy and operating committees. AS would still make a recommendation for students to serve on this committee.

Q: There are 4 spaces for students right now and I'd recommend this be kept.

A: Thank you.

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

A: We will clarify this. We meant for this committee to make a recommendation to the parent committee as it is done now.

Q: This is not a replacement of I&SA?

A: No, currently there is a Student Success Committee that reports to I&SA, this committee will become a special agency and be much smaller.

Q: One of my concerns with the small number of faculty on the committee and the number of disciplines on campus is that all faculty will not be represented as well as they currently are on I&SA. I'm glad to hear that Student Success will still report to I&SA.

A: That won't be changed.

**B. University Library Board (ULB) – None.**

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

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

**Questions:**

**Q:** Has the committee considered having separate course numbers for those internships that require a university placement?

**A:** We haven't considered it, but will.

**Q:** On line 75, can you explain what it means to provide at least one option? If a department has 50 different options, one of which has been vetted, but a student takes that option first then another student comes along and that option is closed, does the department have to provide an option with an opening, or just provide the option?

**A:** The department does not have to provide a list of 50 options, because if the department provides a list of 50 options then each of them will require a UOA.

**Q:** When the EO came out we all needed the UOA. The argument was that it was a risk management issue, so how did the risk go away?

**A:** We are one of the first campuses creating the policy and UOAs, and in the process risk management is learning what their liability is. As a couple other campuses have come on line with their policies, we have determined we don't need to go as far as we

had been with our UOAs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **A. Associated Students President –**

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

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

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

### **C. CSU Statewide Senators –**

Former Chancellor Charles Reed passed away this week.

The community colleges changed the prerequisites for math courses which will impact transfers, because now a course without a prerequisite of Algebra can qualify

a student to take Statistics. Certain disciplines such as Business and Economics haven't had a chance to go back and review those courses yet. The process is being fixed, but particularly for those disciplines that really require Algebra, they should speak to their chairs about this.

**D. Provost –**

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

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

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

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

**Questions:**

Q: (Senator Sabalius) "I have heard that Chancellor White plans on coming out with a statement that 3-unit courses are the norm in the CSU, is this true?"

A: (Provost Feinstein) "I have not heard that and neither has anyone in my team."

Q: (Senator Sabalius) "It came out from Undergraduate Studies."

A: (Deputy Provost Kemnitz) "I read something to that effect in some minutes, but I have not heard anything."

Q: (Senator Khan) “How will the California Promise affect priority registration and what numbers are we looking at?”

A: (Provost Feinstein) “There are a couple California Promises out there and one is about free tuition for community college. Is that what you are talking about?”

Q: (Senator Khan) “No, priority registration.”

A: (Provost Feinstein) “We are trying to be one of the campuses that adopt this in the first phase because we think that anything we can focus on students getting their mind set on 15 units a semester gets them a 4-year degree. The challenge with that version of California Promise is that everybody is on priority registration, so what does that mean? We are really struggling with what priority registration is and how it impacts all our students. We really haven’t vetted this completely. This is something we are working on.”

A: (Deputy Provost Kemnitz) “A referral was made to the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee.”

A: (Provost Feinstein) “We are one of the first to want to participate in this, but we haven’t been informed of all the expectations of that program yet.”

Q: (Senator Shifflett) “Can you let us know where we are with respect to the number of applications vs the 8,000 spots?”

A: (Provost Feinstein) “VP Blaylock can share the actual number of students that have applied.”

Q: (Senator Laker) “Could you and VP Blaylock share with the body what has led to the increase in graduation rates?”

A: (Provost Feinstein) “It is really hard to say because we have 20 to 30 student success initiatives going on simultaneously. We will have a new version of our Four Pillars of Success coming out in January.”

Q: (Senator Peter) “With regard to the degree completion scholarships, why were those five particular departments targeted?”

A: (Provost Feinstein) “Our research indicated that these five departments were where most of the students that would graduate in 4 ½ years were coming from.”

Q: (Senator Peter) “Should more departments be considering offering additional summer classes to accommodate the summer scholarships, or just those five departments?”

A: (Deputy Provost Kemnitz) “Upper division GE is likely to be needed by those students.” Deputy Provost Kemnitz will get back to the Senate with details.

**E. Vice President of Finance and Administration –**

Faculty will be moved back into DMH in January. The Fire Marshal will inspect the building tomorrow.

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

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

**Questions:**

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

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

(VP Faas) “Okay.”

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

**F. Vice President for Student Affairs –**

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

**IX. Special Committee Reports – None**

**X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 4:44 p.m.**

**Executive Committee Meeting**  
**November 28, 2016**  
**12-1:30 pm ADM 167**

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

1. The minutes of 11-14-16 were approved as amended by Senator Mathur (11-0-0).
2. The consent calendar 11-28-16 was approved (11-0-0).

3. Updates:

a. From the Provost:

The new Dean of the College of Engineering, Sheryl Erhman, will be here July 1, 2017.

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

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

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

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

- b. The AVP of FDO search ended with a fantastic candidate. However, we were unable to close the hire. There is another good candidate, but if that person does not work a new search will be conducted.

- c. Hoover Hall will be coming down soon and there will be some construction noise.
  - d. DMH is almost finished and a packing and moving schedule will be sent out soon.
  - e. The head football coach has been released. A search committee will be formed soon. The committee discussed the buyout of the coach's contract. This will be paid by the Tower Foundation.
4. Selection and Review of Administrators:  
The committee discussed the procedures for the selection and review of deans. There are issues with small departments. The committee discussed possibly having an election for two chairs, and then three additional faculty members from anywhere. There is no procedure for the Provost to remove a member if need be.
5. The meeting adjourned at 1:33 p.m.

These minutes were taken by the Senate Administrator on November 28, 2016, and were edited by Chair Michael Kimbarow on December 7, 2016. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on January 11, 2017.

**Executive Committee Meeting**  
**December 5, 2016**  
**12-1:30, ADM 167**

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

Absent: Papazian, Lanning, Kaufman, Kimbarow

1. Approval of 11/28/16 meeting minutes - Not available for review.
2. Consent Calendar - No new appointees.
3. Review of nominee for Board of Trustees faculty position  
Discussion regarding the nominee from SJSU  
Vote: 10-0-0 to move the nominee from SJSU forward
4. Strategic Planning Steering Committee update:  
This committee met last Monday and divided into five subgroups to address the status of the strategic goals of 2017 by soliciting information across the campus. Information will be distributed across the campus regarding the accomplishment of the strategic goals over the course of time.

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

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

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

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

5. Selection and review of administrators  
O & G is deliberating the policy recommendation.  
O & G committee members are concerned about how to address the issue of insuring diversity of committee membership.  
Considerations are being made for a combination of elected members and appointed members to look at committee membership as a means to address diversity.  
Concerns about potential issues of membership behavior and expectations of members.

Consider having the faculty elect seven faculty from the college and then the Executive Committee selects five from the seven to serve.

Policy currently is silent regarding the distribution of faculty across the departments within the college.

6. Communication during policy-making/revision:  
Communication among administrators and policy committees should occur prior to the first reading and between the first and second reading.
7. Policy committee updates:
  - a. C&R –
    - i. Revisiting the internship policy as additional information has been received from the Chancellor's office since the policy was passed. A UOA is only needed when the university makes the placement, if the student is making the internship arrangements without the university input no UOA is needed. If students are finding their own placement they still need to complete a self-statement form; request to keep this information held within the department. If the internship is an elective course, then no UOA is needed. The revised policy recommendation should be the first reading at the next senate meeting.
    - ii. Department name change – need for departments to go through the Dean's office for potential name change. C&R has a current referral regarding department name changes.
  - b. ISA – No report
  - c. O&G –  
Previous issues discussed for selection and review of administrators.
  - d. PS –  
Policy replacement on privacy of electronic information; there is a UC system policy that is being used as a framework to move a new policy forward.
8. Updates
  - a. Associated Students – Alternative Spring Break – change in dates for event to occur after the Spring semester is finished; AS House has a light show; strategic planning is being addressed by AS; public forum for students addressing tuition fees; discussion of what does it mean to “stand in solidarity” for the AS 1636.
  - b. VP Student Affairs – admissions for freshmen and transfer students is up from last year; mobile food pantry saw significant increases.

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

**Executive Committee Meeting**  
**January 11, 2017**  
**12-1:30, ADM 167**

Present: Peter, Shifflett, Schultz-Krohn, Mathur, Frazier, Lee, Feinstein, Faas, Kaufman, Kimbarow, Wong(Lau)

Absent: Papazian, Blaylock, Riley, Pérea

1. The minutes of November 28, 2016 were approved as amended by Senator Kaufman.
2. The minutes of December 5, 2016 were approved as amended by Senator Mathur.
3. Updates:
  - a. Provost:

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

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

There is a heavy volume of cases on campus right now. The majority involve stalking or intoxication. Most of the cases are student-on-student.
4. The committee discussed and selected nominees to recommend to the President for the CIO Search Committee. The Provost will ask the President for recommendations for the community member on the search committee and the Executive Committee will discuss via email later this week.
5. The committee discussed the Institute for Sport, Society and Social Change. The Provost is drafting an ORU proposal to submit to C&R/Graduate Studies and Research for review and approval. It was recommended that the Provost work with AVP Stacks. The idea is to bring faculty and students together to work jointly.

6. The meeting adjourned at 1:37 p.m.

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

**Executive Committee Meeting**  
**January 30, 2017**  
**12-1:30, ADM 167**

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

Absent: Perea, Wong(Lau)

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

2. Updates:

a. From the President:

President Papazian thanked Vice Chair Stef Frazier for an excellent Senate Retreat.

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

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

b. From the Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs/Provost:

Provost Feinstein had a meeting with CASA Chairs and Directors and the Dean to discuss how we can create synergies in the fields of health on campus. Chairs and Directors of CASA are working on a paper describing the current and recommended structure and name of the college.

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

c. From the Vice President of Administration and Finance (VPAF):

There was a fire in the South Garage on Saturday night. It was deliberately started under one of our trucks. There are too many levels in the garage and hidden spaces

to have cameras all over. However, UPD is planning to put cameras at the entrances/exits of the garages so they can see when someone enters and leaves the garage.

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

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

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

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

- 3. The meeting adjourned at 1:37 p.m.

These minutes were taken and transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice on January 30, 2017. The minutes were edited by Chair Kimbarow on February 5, 2017. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on February 6, 2017.

**Consent Calendar**

12-Dec-16

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Last Name/First Name</b>	<b>Term</b>	<b>Phone</b>	<b>Seat/College</b>
Student Evaluation and Review Board	Currin-Percival, Mary		924-1154	CoSS
Program Planning	Ramasubramanian, Anand		924-3922	CoE
Sustainability Board	Sinha, Xhavin			CoE

**REMOVE:**

O & G	Peggy Boylan-Ashraf
Faculty Diversity	Peggy Boylan-Ashraf
O & G	Julia Curry (sabbatical)



**Academic Senate**  
**2017-2018 Calendar of Meetings**  
 Senate, Executive Committee,  
 and Policy Committees

**Office of the Academic Senate**  
 Administration Building 176, 0024  
 Office: 4-2440 Fax: 4-2451  
<http://www.sjsu.edu/senate>  
[eva.joice@sjsu.edu](mailto:eva.joice@sjsu.edu)

<b>Fall 2017</b>		<b>Spring 2018</b>	
Aug. 28	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meeting (2-4 p.m.)	Jan. 29	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meetings (2-4 p.m.)
Sept. 11	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meetings (2-4 p.m.)	Feb. 5	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meetings (2-4 p.m.)
<b>Sept. 18</b>	<b>Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)</b>	<b>Feb. 12</b>	<b>Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)</b>
Sept. 25	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meetings (2-4 p.m.)	Feb. 19	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meetings (2-4pm)
Oct. 2	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meeting (2-4 p.m.)	Mar. 5	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meetings (2-4pm)
<b>Oct. 9</b>	<b>Senate Meeting (2-4 p.m.) (AA and University Budget)</b>	<b>Mar. 12</b>	<b>Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)</b>
Oct. 16	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meeting (2-4 p.m.)	Mar. 19	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meetings (2-4 p.m.)
<b>Oct. 23</b>	<b>Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)</b>	Apr. 2	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meeting (2-4 p.m.)
Oct. 30	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meeting (2-4 p.m.)	<b>Apr. 9</b>	<b>Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)</b>
Nov. 6	Policy Committee Meetings (2-4 p.m.)	Apr. 16	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meetings (2-4 p.m.)
Nov. 13	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meeting (2-4 p.m.)	Apr. 23	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meetings (2-4 p.m.)
<b>Nov. 20</b>	<b>Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)</b>		
Nov. 27	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meetings (2-4 p.m.)	<b>April 30</b>	<b>Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)</b>
Dec. 4	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meetings (2-4 p.m.)	May 7	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meeting (2-4 p.m.)
<b>Dec. 11</b>	<b>Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)</b>	<b>May 14</b>	<b>Senate Meeting (2-4 p.m. Last of 2016-17)</b> <b>Senate Meeting (4-5 p.m. First of 2017-18)</b>
<p><b>Meeting Locations:</b> All Senate meetings held in Engr. 285/287; Exec. Meetings held in ADM 167; Policy Committees – check with Senate Office</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> Campus closed Sept. 5 (Labor Day), Nov. 11 (Veteran’s Day), Nov. 23 non-instruction day, Nov. 24-25 (Thanksgiving); Dec. 12 last day of classes. Finals begin Dec. 14.</p>		<p>Senate Retreat: January 26, 2017</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> Jan. 1 New Years Day, Jan. 15 MLK Day, Mar. 26-Mar. 30. Spring Recess, Mar. 30 Cesar Chavez Day-Campus closed. Last day classes May 14. Finals begin May 16.</p>	

Approved by Executive Committee \_\_\_\_\_ February 6, 2017

Approved by Senate \_\_\_\_\_

6  
7  
8 **POLICY**  
9 **RECOMMENDATION**  
10 **Adopting New SOTE and SOLATE Instruments**

11  
12  
13 Resolved: That the attached documents following be adopted as the text for revised  
14 Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTE) and Student Opinion of  
15 Laboratory Teaching Effectiveness (SOLATE) questionnaires; be it further

16  
17 Resolved: That this become effective for the administration of all SOTEs and  
18 SOLATEs as soon as practicable.

19  
20 *Rationale: F12-6, Evaluation in Effectiveness in Teaching for all Faculty, states:*

21  
22 *SERB shall prepare the specific questions and survey instrument to be*  
23 *used to measure student opinions of teaching effectiveness. It shall decide*  
24 *the scale, format, and layout of the instrument, and determine the*  
25 *information that is provided in the reports generated by the surveys. The*  
26 *instrument shall be approved by the Senate upon recommendation of*  
27 *SERB and the Professional Standards Committee, and may only be*  
28 *amended by SERB.*

29  
30 *SERB is a board specifically appointed for expertise on survey research and contains the*  
31 *AVP for IEA as an advisor. Professional Standards and the Senate may accept or reject*  
32 *the survey instruments provided by SERB, but may not amend the text of the survey*  
33 *instrument.*

34  
35 *For the rationale explaining the changes to the questions in the SOTE and SOLATE*  
36 *instrument, Professional Standards refers you to the version of this policy passed by the*  
37 *Senate on October 24, 2016, which was itself a modified version of a proposal returned to*  
38 *committee by the Senate on May 9, 2016. The October 24 policy recommendation was*  
39 *returned by the President without signature with several concerns expressed. This*  
40 *rationale is restricted to addressing those concerns:*

- 41 1) *There was a typographical error in numbering the questions; this has been*  
42 *corrected.*  
43 2) *There was a minor discrepancy in the phrasing of the open ended questions on the*  
44 *SOTE and SOLATE. This has been corrected.*  
45 3) *There was concern about the new language in the SOTE/SOLATE instructions*  
46 *indicating that the instrument is not designed to provide feedback “on your*  
47 *instructor’s physical appearance.” This was added at the request of instructors*  
48 *who have received inappropriate feedback about their attractiveness and other*  
49 *variables that are either outside of their control and/or inappropriate for comment*  
50 *on the professional evaluation of their work—in some cases bordering on a kind of*  
51 *anonymous harassment. SERB conducted a review of appropriate literature and*  
52 *found that these instructions may be helpful in addressing a known gender bias in*  
53 *student evaluations (MacNell, Driscoll, & Hunt, 2015) and are unlikely to introduce*

54 *unconscious bias (e.g., Duguid & Hunt 2015). Furthermore, since the teaching*  
55 *evaluation policy (F12-6) lists “comments on personal appearance” among those*  
56 *items that are inappropriate and that may be removed prior to placement in the*  
57 *personnel file, it is in the interest of the University to prevent such comments from*  
58 *being recorded in the first place.*

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

68  
69 *Professional Standards endorses these changes and reminds the Senate that these*  
70 *revisions are now in their third year of Senate review. The last time the instruments were*  
71 *changed was in 2004.*

72  
73  
74  
75 *Approved: 1/30/2017*

76 *Vote: 9--0-1*

77  
78 *Present: Peter, Green, White, Lee, Reade, Kauppila, Caesar, Hamedi-Hagh, Caesar,*  
79 *Hwang*

80  
81 *Absent: None*

82  
83 *Approved by the Student Evaluation Review Board 1/25/2017*

84 *Vote: 6-0-0*

85 *Present: Slusser, Venkatsubramany, Smith, Lee, Eirinaki, Heil*

86 *Absent: Strage*

87  
88 *Financial Impact: No changes over the previous policy.*

89  
90 *Workload Impact: Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics (IEA) will need to update the*  
91 *online questionnaires.*

93 **Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTE) Revision**

94 January 2017 Revision

95

96 **Instructions**

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

104 The instructor:

105

106 1. Demonstrated relevance of the course content.

107 5. Strongly Agree

108 4. Agree

109 3. Neutral

110 2. Disagree

111 1. Strongly Disagree

112 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

113

114 2. Used assignments that enhanced learning.

115 5. Strongly Agree

116 4. Agree

117 3. Neutral

118 2. Disagree

119 1. Strongly Disagree

120 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

121

122 3. Summarized/emphasized important points.

123 5. Strongly Agree

124 4. Agree

125 3. Neutral

126 2. Disagree

127 1. Strongly Disagree

128 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

129

130 4. Was responsive to questions and comments from students.

131 5. Strongly Agree

132 4. Agree

133 3. Neutral

134 2. Disagree

135 1. Strongly Disagree

136 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

137

138 5. Established an atmosphere that facilitated learning.

139 5. Strongly Agree

140 4. Agree

141 3. Neutral

142 2. Disagree

143 1. Strongly Disagree

144 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

145

146 6. Was approachable for assistance.

- 147 5. Strongly Agree  
 148 4. Agree  
 149 3. Neutral  
 150 2. Disagree  
 151 1. Strongly Disagree  
 152 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
 153
- 154 7. Was respectful of the diversity of students in this class.  
 155 5. Strongly Agree  
 156 4. Agree  
 157 3. Neutral  
 158 2. Disagree  
 159 1. Strongly Disagree  
 160 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
 161
- 162 8. Showed strong interest in teaching this class.  
 163 5. Strongly Agree  
 164 4. Agree  
 165 3. Neutral  
 166 2. Disagree  
 167 1. Strongly Disagree  
 168 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
 169
- 170 9. Used teaching methods that helped students learn important concepts.  
 171 5. Strongly Agree  
 172 4. Agree  
 173 3. Neutral  
 174 2. Disagree  
 175 1. Strongly Disagree  
 176 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
 177
- 178 10. Used grading criteria that were clear.  
 179 5. Strongly Agree  
 180 4. Agree  
 181 3. Neutral  
 182 2. Disagree  
 183 1. Strongly Disagree  
 184 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
 185
- 186 11. Helped students analyze complex/abstract ideas.  
 187 5. Strongly Agree  
 188 4. Agree  
 189 3. Neutral  
 190 2. Disagree  
 191 1. Strongly Disagree  
 192 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
 193
- 194 12. Provided meaningful feedback about student work.  
 195 5. Strongly Agree  
 196 4. Agree  
 197 3. Neutral  
 198 2. Disagree  
 199 1. Strongly Disagree  
 200 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
 201
- 202 13. Overall, this instructor's teaching was effective.

- 203 5. Strongly Agree  
204 4. Agree  
205 3. Neutral  
206 2. Disagree  
207 1. Strongly Disagree  
208 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
209

210 **Free-Response Questions:**  
211

- 212 14. What do you think are the strengths of this instructor's teaching?  
213  
214 15. What suggestions, if any, do you have to further improve the instructor's teaching?  
  
215 16. If you like, please use this space to elaborate on your responses.  
216

217 **Informational Items:**  
218

- 219 17. What is your current estimate of your expected overall grade in this course?

- 220 A  
221 B  
222 C  
223 D or F  
224 Other (Credit/No Credit, Incomplete, etc.)  
225

- 226 18. You are a:

- 227 Freshman  
228 Sophomore  
229 Junior  
230 Senior  
231 Graduate Student  
232 Credential Only  
233 Other (e.g. Open University)  
234

- 235 19. Did you complete this form without undue influence from other students?

- 236 Yes  
237 No  
238

- 239 20. Did you complete this form without undue influence from the instructor?

- 240 Yes  
241 No  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246

250  
251 **Instructions**

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

259 The lab or activity instructor:

260  
261 1. Made course requirements clear.

262 5. Strongly Agree

263 4. Agree

264 3. Neutral

265 2. Disagree

266 1. Strongly Disagree

267 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

268

269 2. Used grading criteria that were clear.

270 5. Strongly Agree

271 4. Agree

272 3. Neutral

273 2. Disagree

274 1. Strongly Disagree

275 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

276

277 3. Was well prepared for class or activity.

278 5. Strongly Agree

279 4. Agree

280 3. Neutral

281 2. Disagree

282 1. Strongly Disagree

283 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

284

285 4. Showed concern for student success in the course, and was accessible and responsive to students

286 5. Strongly Agree

287 4. Agree

288 3. Neutral

289 2. Disagree

290 1. Strongly Disagree

291 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

292

293

294 5. Made the class environment safe for students, including demonstration of the proper use of any  
295 equipment and techniques.

296 5. Strongly Agree

297 4. Agree

298 3. Neutral

299 2. Disagree

300 1. Strongly Disagree

301 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

- 302  
303 6. Helped me integrate the lecture concepts with the class/activity.  
304 5. Strongly Agree  
305 4. Agree  
306 3. Neutral  
307 2. Disagree  
308 1. Strongly Disagree  
309 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
310
- 311 7. Increased my understanding of the subject.  
312 5. Strongly Agree  
313 4. Agree  
314 3. Neutral  
315 2. Disagree  
316 1. Strongly Disagree  
317 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
318
- 319 8. Stimulated my interest in the subject.  
320 5. Strongly Agree  
321 4. Agree  
322 3. Neutral  
323 2. Disagree  
324 1. Strongly Disagree  
325 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
326
- 327 9. Overall, this instructor's teaching was effective.  
328 5. Strongly Agree  
329 4. Agree  
330 3. Neutral  
331 2. Disagree  
332 1. Strongly Disagree  
333 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
334
- 335 **Free-Response Questions:**  
336
- 337 10. What do you think are the strengths of this instructor's teaching?  
338
- 339 11. What suggestions, if any, do you have to further improve the instructor's teaching?  
340
- 341 12. If you like, please use this space to elaborate on your responses.  
342
- 343 **Informational Items:**  
344
- 345 13. What is your current estimate of your expected overall grade in this course?  
346 A  
347 B  
348 C  
349 D or F  
350 Other (Credit/No Credit, Incomplete, etc.)  
351
- 352 14. You are a:  
353 Freshman  
354 Sophomore  
355 Junior  
356 Senior  
357 Graduate Student

358            Credential Only  
359            Other (e.g. Open University)

360

361    15. Did you complete this form without undue influence from other students?

362            Yes

363            No

364

365    16. Did you complete this form without undue influence from the instructor?

366            Yes

367            No

368

369

370

371

6  
7 **Policy Recommendation**  
8 **Amendment A to S16-8**  
9 **Selection and Review of Administrators**

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

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

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

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

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

Whereas: Diverse representation is important, therefore, be it

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

Rationale: All faculty do have the opportunity to participate in the review and selection of academic deans through solicited input. However, providing the faculty in each college with the option to elect any faculty member who is interested in serving on a selection or review committee, permits each college to select from among all its faculty members the representatives they would like to have serve on a selection or review committee for academic Deans. Additional language was added to encourage at the beginning of the process outreach that results in a diverse search/review committee pool of candidates and to reinforce the importance of confidentiality throughout the search/review process.

48 Approved: 2/6/17  
49 Vote: 5-1-3  
50 Present: Grosvenor, Laker, Shifflett, Rajkovic, Ormsbee, Boekema,  
51 Hart, Tran, Bailey  
52 Absent: Higgins  
53 Financial Impact: None expected  
54 Workload Impact: No change from current situation.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94

# Selection and Review of Administrators

## 1. Academic Administrator and Vice President Searches and Appointments

### 1.1 Applicability

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

### 1.2. Vacancies and Initiation of Procedures

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

### 1.3 Composition of Search Committees

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

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

#### 1.3.1.1 Recruitment Procedures

Recruitment of the faculty and staff members shall be arranged and conducted by the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate through normal committee on committees processes. Interested faculty and staff will submit written statements reflecting their interest and qualifications.

143 Each chair is expected to encourage faculty and staff from their department to  
144 serve on the search committee so that the resulting ballots, as best as possible,  
145 reflect the diverse nature of the programs, students, and faculty in their college  
146 and the campus.

147  
148 Following the close of nominations and before a ballot is constructed, the Provost  
149 will review the pool and consider the extent to which it is a representative group.  
150 The review can include, though is not limited to, representation of the programs  
151 in the college and the composition of the pool with regard to gender and ethnicity.

152  
153 If the pool appears insufficiently representative, the Provost would consult with  
154 the Senate's Executive Committee to determine how best to improve the  
155 representativeness of the search committee pool of candidates.

#### 156 157 1.3.1.2 Election Procedures

158  
159 The Senate office will forward the statements of each candidate to the college  
160 office so they can be distributed to faculty/staff.

161  
162 1.3.1.2.1 Elections for the faculty representatives from the college shall be  
163 arranged and conducted by ad hoc election committee comprised of all  
164 department chairs not on the ballot in that college.

165  
166 The ballot will be constructed by college staff to enable faculty to vote for  
167 five faculty including at least two chairs. Faculty receiving the most votes,  
168 taking into consideration tenure status, department, and the need for two  
169 chairs, shall be appointed to the committee by the Provost.

170  
171 1.3.1.2.2 Election of the staff representative will be arranged and  
172 conducted by staff in the college office who are not on the ballot.

#### 173 174 1.3.1.3 Appointment Procedures

175  
176 The Provost appoints the community member or administrator, Dean, and a  
177 student.

178  
179 Each department in the college shall nominate one student from its majors. The  
180 Provost shall designate, from among those nominated, one student as a  
181 committee member.

182  
183 Those appointed should have experience or expertise relevant to one or more of  
184 the programs in the college and/or the position of Dean.

185  
186 **1.3.2 *Special Procedures for the Dean of the University Library.*** The search  
187 committee shall be composed of nine members: three faculty librarians selected by and  
188 from the faculty librarians; one Library staff member, selected by the staff of the  
189 university library; one department chair from outside the library; one faculty member  
190 (not a chair) from outside the library; one student, one Dean (from outside the Library),

191 and one member of the community, each designated by the Provost. The faculty  
192 committee chair shall be appointed by the Provost.

193  
194 **1.3.3 *Special Procedures for the Dean of International & Extended Studies (IES).***  
195 The search committee shall be composed of nine members: five faculty (inclusive of two  
196 department chairs); two IES staff members, selected by the staff of IES; one Dean (from  
197 outside IES), and one student, each designated by the Provost. The faculty committee  
198 chair shall be appointed by the Provost.

199  
200 Selected members should exhibit clear evidence of understanding IES and a history of  
201 engagement with the programs and activities of IES.

## 202 **1.4 Recruitment and Selection of Committee Members**

203  
204  
205 **1.4.1 *Recruitment.*** Except as provided in 1.3.1, ~~1.3.2,~~ and ~~1.3.3~~ above, an open  
206 nomination process for potential members for search and review committees shall be  
207 used. The Academic Senate shall publish notice of intention to appoint a search  
208 committee and shall solicit written statements either in hard copy or electronically for  
209 membership on the committee from the University community. Nominations (including  
210 self-nominations) must include a statement of interest and qualifications and include the  
211 nominee's signed or electronic consent to serve by the published nomination deadline.

212  
213 **1.4.2 *Selection.*** Except as provided in 1.3.1, ~~1.3.2,~~ and ~~1.3.3~~ above, committee  
214 members shall be selected, from among those nominated, by mutual consent of the  
215 President and the Senate Executive Committee. If the President and the Executive  
216 Committee cannot arrive at mutual agreement, the President (or Provost, if the search is  
217 not for a vice president) shall confer with the chair of the Senate to attempt to arrive at a  
218 mutually satisfactory course of action. Failing that, the President or Provost shall  
219 appoint the membership. The President or Provost shall select the committee chair from  
220 the committee membership.

## 221 **1.5. Scope and Procedures**

222  
223  
224 The President or Provost shall determine the scope and procedures of the search  
225 process in consultation with the committee. The scope and procedures of the search,  
226 the target date for the report, the minimum requirements for candidates, the  
227 qualifications of the expected finalists, and other matters relating to the selection  
228 process should be discussed. The scope of the search shall always be as wide as  
229 feasible under the circumstances and shall be conducted in accordance with the  
230 University's policies and procedures on equal opportunity and diversity. Likely  
231 candidates must be interviewed. Provisions should be made for the campus community  
232 to meet the candidates. The deliberations and recommendations of the committee shall  
233 be confidential. Concerns regarding unethical conduct, inclusive of breaches of  
234 confidentiality, should be reported to the Provost or President. Unethical conduct will  
235 result in dismissal of the committee member by the Provost or President.

## 236 237 **1.6. Committee Recommendations**

239

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

246

### 247 **1.7. Action by the President**

248

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

255

### 256 **1.8. Interim Appointments**

257

258 An interim appointment occurs when a position covered by this policy has or will be  
259 vacated and there is insufficient time or it is otherwise impractical to complete the  
260 normal search process explained above. The President or Provost, in consultation with  
261 the elected members of the Senate Executive Committee, may make interim  
262 appointments.

263

264 Alternatively, at the discretion of the President or Provost, the selection process for an  
265 interim appointee may utilize a selection committee wherein the interim position is  
266 announced campus-wide and interviews are held. While there is no requirement to  
267 announce the position off-campus, such announcement is not prohibited. The search  
268 committee must be no smaller than three people and will be selected by the President  
269 or Provost in consultation with the elected members of the Senate Executive  
270 Committee. Interim appointments usually are for a period of one year, unless a different  
271 period is specified at the time of the appointment. An interim appointment may be  
272 renewed or extended by the President or Provost as needed in consultation with the  
273 elected members of the Senate Executive Committee.

274

### 275 **1.9. Acting Appointments**

276

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

287 renewed or extended by the President or Provost in consultation with the elected  
288 members of the Senate Executive Committee.

289

## 290 **2. Reviews of Administrators**

291

### 292 **2.1. Timing of Review**

293

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

299

### 300 **2.2. Appointment and Composition of Review Committee**

301

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

306

### 307 **2.3 Criteria for Review**

308

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

314

### 315 **2.4 Procedures for Review**

316

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

332

### 333 **2.5. Report of the Review Committee**

334

335 2.5.1 The review committee shall consult with the President (for all vice  
336 presidents) or the Provost (for all other offices) before drafting its report.  
337 Following that consultation, and at the conclusion of its evaluative activities, the  
338 review committee shall prepare a written report embodying findings and  
339 conclusions. The report of the review committee shall include a statement of  
340 strengths found and improvements desired in the incumbent's performance with  
341 respect to the evaluative criteria. All raw data collected for review shall  
342 accompany, but not be part of, the review committee's report.  
343

344 2.5.2 The report shall normally contain a specific recommendation by the review  
345 committee that the incumbent be reappointed or not be reappointed, with or  
346 without qualification. A majority vote of the review committee shall be sufficient to  
347 approve the report; the numerical vote shall be stated in the report. A minority  
348 report or reports shall be appended if requested by any member of the  
349 committee. Minority reports shall be seen by all members of a review committee.  
350

351 2.5.3 Before forwarding the report, the review committee shall:

- 352 • provide a draft copy of the proposed report to the incumbent [SEP]
- 353 • provide the incumbent with an opportunity to meet with the review committee  
354 in order to discuss the report [SEP]
- 355 • provide the incumbent with the opportunity to submit to the committee a  
356 written statement which shall become part of the report to the President.  
357

358 2.5.4 The President (for all vice presidents) or the Provost (for all other offices)  
359 shall again consult with the review committee to share his or her inclination and  
360 the reasons therefore.  
361

## 362 2.6. Action of the President

363

364 Ultimate responsibility for the retention of administrators belongs solely to the President.  
365 If, after discussion with the review committee, the incumbent, and other appropriate  
366 sources of information, the President is inclined to believe a decision other than that  
367 recommended by the committee would best serve the interests of the University, before  
368 acting on that inclination the President shall consult with the Executive Committee of the  
369 Academic Senate, at which time both the report of the review committee and the  
370 reasons why the President is inclined to a decision other than that recommended would  
371 be revealed to and shared with the Executive Committee. The purpose of such a  
372 meeting would be to ascertain if some mutually agreeable course of action or decision  
373 can be found upon which the President could act. Failing that, the President shall make  
374 such decision as he or she considers best for the welfare of the University.  
375

1 San José State University  
2 Academic Senate  
3 Curriculum and Research Committee  
4 February 13, 2017  
5 Final Reading  
6

AS 1641

7 **Policy Recommendation:**  
8 **Amendment A to University Policy S16-14:**  
9 **Clarification of ‘Internship’**

10

11 **Legislative History:** Amends S16-14

12

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

17

18 **Resolved:** That the following amendments be adopted immediately.

19

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

26

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

34

35 **Whereas:** SJSU provides significant opportunities for internships, service learning,  
36 and community engagement in many departments (the majority of SJSU  
37 departments offer either service learning or internships), some of which  
38 are credit bearing or are an academic degree requirements and are  
39 therefore covered by Executive Order 1064; and

40

41 **Whereas:** CSU Executive Order 1064 requires a student internship policy  
42 governing internships where the university makes the placement (e.g.,  
43 instructor provides the site(s) from which students must choose their  
44 internship, service learning, or off-campus experience); and  
45

46 **Whereas:** An ad hoc committee with representation and input from three university  
47 divisions, Administration and Finance (Contracts and Purchasing; and  
48 Risk Management), Student Affairs (Career Center), and Academic  
49 Affairs (Center for Community Learning and Leadership and Graduate  
50 and Undergraduate Programs) worked for 4 years on the development  
51 of this policy and University-Organization Agreement (UOA), and a  
52 larger ad hoc committee (IFAC, Internship Faculty Advisory Committee)  
53 created in Fall 2014, including additional representation from the seven  
54 academic colleges, has given input on all aspects of this policy and the  
55 UOA; therefore be it  
56

57 **Resolved:** That a University-Organization Agreement (UOA) template be created,  
58 consistent with the CSU system requirements, and overseen and  
59 maintained by the Office of Student and Faculty Success and  
60 designated offices (e.g., Center for Community Learning and  
61 Leadership; CCLL) and when changes are needed in the standard UOA  
62 template (not the modifications at the department/program level), these  
63 changes will be reviewed and approved by the University Curriculum &  
64 Research Committee; and be it further  
65

66 **Resolved:** That a department and/or college will utilize the standard UOA template  
67 for Internships, Service Learning, and Off-Campus Learning  
68 Experiences where the university makes the placement, but can modify  
69 it, as needed, in consultation with and upon approval from  
70 Administration and Finance (e.g., Contracts and Purchasing, Risk  
71 Management) and notification to the Office of Student and Faculty  
72 Success; and be it further  
73

74 **Resolved:** That if the internship is a degree requirement then students may make  
75 their own placement, but the department/program must provide at least  
76 one university-approved placement option requiring a UOA or an  
77 alternative experience as approved by department/program (e.g.,  
78 course, independent study); be it further  
79

- 80 **Resolved:** That if an internship is an elective for a degree program, it should be  
81 clear (i.e., through catalog description, advising, and other program  
82 materials) to the student that he/she will make their own placement and  
83 no UOA will be required; be it further  
84
- 85 **Resolved:** That when a student makes his or her own internship arrangements, the  
86 student must sign a self-placement declaration on the Learning Plan  
87 stating that the university did not make the placement and that the student  
88 be made aware that the learning site is not covered in terms of liability, but  
89 that the student is covered by CSU credit liability insurance (i.e.,  
90 SAFECLIP), so long as the student is in good standing while completing  
91 the internship and registered/enrolled in a course that requires internship  
92 experience; be it further  
93
- 94 **Resolved:** That for all internships, the student's individual Learning Plan (LP) and  
95 Participation Guidelines (PG) be created at the department level to  
96 ensure that the non-SJSU learning site, the faculty member coordinating  
97 and overseeing the internship and the students involved are in  
98 agreement about the nature of the academic requirements and expected  
99 outcomes; and be it further
- 100
- 101 **Resolved:** That the LP define the course expectations and learning outcomes  
102 associated with the internship and that the outcomes of the LP relate to  
103 the course learning outcomes or the program learning outcomes; and be  
104 it further  
105
- 106 **Resolved:** That the LP is provided to the employer or site supervisor providing the  
107 internship; and be it further  
108
- 109 **Resolved:** That full implementation of UOA, LP, and PG documents; and training  
110 as necessary be developed and overseen by the Office of Student and  
111 Faculty Success and designated offices (i.e., CCLL); and be it further  
112
- 113 **Resolved:** That the campus, under the leadership of the Office of Student and  
114 Faculty Success, investigate and implement solutions to streamline and  
115 develop a simpler process for establishing agreements with partner sites  
116 and develop procedures to address unique situations across  
117 departments and students; and be it further  
118
- 119 **Resolved:** That all learning sites be entered into the CSU database in a timely

120 fashion consistent with the development of this system-wide database,  
121 and the training of SJSU faculty and staff with its implementation with  
122 particular emphasis on risk management issues; and be it further  
123

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

126  
127 **Approved (C&R):** February 6, 2017

128 **Vote:** 12-0-0

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

131 **Absent:** Matoush  
132  
133

134 **Curricular Impact:** This policy will bring SJSU into compliance with the governing  
135 CSU  
136 Executive Order. It will also establish procedures to document  
137 that credit-bearing internships, service learning courses, and off-  
138 campus learning experiences have established learning goals.  
139

140 **Financial Impact:** Very closely tied to the Workload Impact. In addition, a new staff  
141 position in Office of Student and Faculty Success is required to  
142 fulfill the UOA processes.  
143

144 **Workload Impact:** Workload will involve time spent orienting students to these  
145 requirements; time spent in coordination with SJSU offices and  
146 the students in handling/processing the required forms (LP, PG,  
147 UOA); and time spent maintaining updated information on the  
148 status of these forms and our partnering organizations.  
149

150 Workload impact will be closely tied to the following factors:  
151 - the number of students enrolled in a given department's  
152 internship program  
153 - the total number of organizations at which the department's  
154 students are interning  
155 - the percentage of the organizations with which a department is  
156 working already has a non-expired UOA on file  
157 -the complexity of the UOA approval process.  
158

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

7 **Policy Recommendation**  
8 **Change in the Membership, Charge, and Category for the**  
9 **Student Success Committee**  
10

11  
12 Legislative History: Rescinds S11-6 which pertains to the membership of the Student  
13 Success Committee.  
14

15 Whereas: SJSU has taken proactive and definitive steps to strategically tackle  
16 issues related to student success through its Student Success Plan, and  
17

18 Whereas: Reorganization of the student success committee in the context of the  
19 Plans' initiatives and goals could facilitate progress campus wide, and  
20

21 Whereas: The current structure and size of the student success committee may not  
22 be the most effective arrangement with regard to the coordination of  
23 efforts to improve student success or to effect changes to advance student  
24 success initiatives, therefore, be it  
25

26 Resolved: That the current student success operating committee be dissolved and in  
27 its place constitute a special agency focused on student success that will  
28 report to the Instruction and Student Affairs Policy Committee, and be it  
29 further  
30

31 Resolved: That the membership and charge of the newly constituted Student  
32 Success Committee be as proposed in this policy recommendation.  
33  
34

35 Rationale: SJSU needs a university-level committee focused on student success that is  
36 populated in a way that puts key representatives together who can help move initiatives  
37 forward, provide objective input on what's working and what's not, and can review and  
38 recommend changes to academic policies, practices, and procedures. With clear  
39 expectations about providing as well as receiving input, this group can be instrumental  
40 in offering advice and nurturing connections that enable all groups engaged in various  
41 aspects of student success to more effectively reach common goals. Constituting this  
42 group as a special agency with reporting responsibilities to the instruction and student  
43 affairs policy committee would work quite well and fits within the guidelines for special  
44 agencies as provided for in our bylaws: "Special agencies are bodies created by policies  
45 recommended by the Academic Senate which, because of functions or membership,  
46 are not designated Senate committees."

47  
48 Approved: 2/6/17  
49 Vote: 9-0-0  
50 Present: Grosvenor, Laker, Shifflett, Rajkovic, Ormsbee, Boekema,  
51 Hart, Tran, Bailey  
52 Absent: Higgins  
53 Financial Impact: None expected  
54 Workload Impact: Increased workload for the originating members as they establish  
55 connections and determine how best to meet the elements of their  
56 charge and effectively impact efforts campus-wide around student  
57 success.  
58

59 **Charge:**

60  
61 In the context of the University's strategic plan, this committee reviews and  
62 recommends changes to academic policies, practices, and procedures as they relate to  
63 all aspects of student success. This would include, but is not limited to, student  
64 enrollment, financial aid, retention, engagement, academic skills and competencies, and  
65 time to degree. The committee will assist in identifying challenges, serve as a central  
66 information resource to gather recommendations and disseminate information on  
67 student success policies and goals and provide advice regarding the planning,  
68 development, and implementation of initiatives designed to facilitate student success.  
69 Individual members are charged with the responsibility of maintaining robust  
70 communications with the groups they are affiliated with. This will be critically important  
71 to the group's ability to formulate sound recommendations that can shape and  
72 coordinate efforts to improve student success.  
73

74 The group will report to the Instruction and Student Affairs Policy Committee. The  
75 Student Success Committee chair, at the conclusion of each academic year, will submit  
76 a report summarizing activities and accomplishments, as all special agencies do, to the  
77 Academic Senate.  
78

79  
80 **Membership:**

81  
82 AVP Transition & Retention Services (Exo)  
83 AVP Faculty & Student Success (Exo)  
84 1 Reps from Academic Affairs - appointed by VP Ac. Affairs (Exo)  
85 1 Reps from Student Affairs - appointed by VP Student Affairs (Exo)  
86 1 Graduate/undergraduate student  
87 2 Undergraduate students  
88 5 faculty  
89  
90

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

95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114

**Recruitment and Appointment of Members**

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

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

6  
7  
8  
9 **POLICY**  
10 **RECOMMENDATION**  
11 **Amendment C to S15-6,**  
12 **Appointment of Regular**  
13 **Faculty Employees;**  
14 **Consideration for Early**  
15 **Tenure for Previously**  
16 **Tenured Faculty**

17  
18  
19 **Resolved:** That S15-6 be amended as shown in the ~~strikeout~~ and underline of the  
20 following excerpt from the policy.

21  
22 **Rationale:** From time to time, tenured faculty at other institutions elect to come to SJSU  
23 and many of them must give up their tenure at their prior institution to do  
24 so—starting over again as untenured faculty at SJSU. Under the terms of  
25 the CBA, SJSU can offer them a maximum of two years of “service credit,”  
26 thus lessening the length of time for tenure at SJSU from six years to four  
27 years. But four years is still a very long time to wait for a faculty member  
28 who has already been through a six year cycle elsewhere. In the past,  
29 some of these previously tenured faculty were encouraged to not only  
30 accept the two years of service credit, but to also apply for tenure a year or  
31 two “early.” This could lessen the time required to regain their previous  
32 status to a total of two or three years.

33  
34 The new RTP policy (S15-8) made the requirements for early tenure more  
35 stringent. This reform was necessary for a variety of reasons and was duly  
36 considered and debated. However, the discussion about early tenure  
37 focused solely on our “native” faculty who begin their careers at SJSU. The  
38 implications of the more stringent standards for previously tenured faculty  
39 was never considered. Professional Standards is concerned that the new  
40 standards removes a tool that was previously available to help us recruit  
41 and retain some of our very best faculty.

42  
43 Professional Standards has considered several ways of addressing this  
44 issue and has consulted with the Provost. The most acceptable strategy  
45 makes use of appointment letters. In this way, the individual situations of  
46 previously tenured faculty can be addressed on a case-by-case basis, with a  
47 judgment made at the time of hiring whether their previous record warrants  
48 special consideration for early tenure. This amendment changes the  
49 appointments policy to allow an appointment letter to make such a  
50 designation.

51  
52  
53 If this policy change were accepted, language in an appointment letter might  
54 read something like this if the University wished to encourage an early  
55 tenure application from a prospect. This particular example encourages an  
56 application for tenure after the fifth year:

57  
58 At SJSU, probationary faculty may apply for early tenure  
59 under the terms explained in University Policy S15-8, which  
60 is attached. The policy specifies much higher standards for

61 early tenure than are required for tenure after a full six year  
62 period. However, in light of your prior tenure at a  
63 comparable university, SJSU offers to evaluate your  
64 application for tenure after five years of probation (with your  
65 service credit counting towards that time) using the normal  
66 standards for tenure. While a favorable decision will still  
67 depend upon your ability to meet our standards, this offer will  
68 give you an option that you may find helpful if you seek to  
69 reduce your time to tenure  
70

71 We believe that the CBA permits this policy change. The CBA reads as  
72 follows:  
73

74 13.3 The normal period of probation shall be a total of six (6)  
75 years of full---time probationary service and credited service,  
76 if any. Any deviation from the normal six (6) year  
77 probationary period shall be the decision of the President  
78 following his/her consideration of recommendations from the  
79 department or equivalent unit and appropriate  
80 administrator(s).  
81

82 The President, through the Provost, would control whether the opportunity  
83 was extended in the appointment letter, and the President, through the  
84 Provost, would also continue to decide whether the early tenure would be  
85 granted at the time of the performance review, thus doubly complying with  
86 CBA 13.3.  
87  
88

89 Approved: Under Review by the Committee  
90

91 Vote: 8-0-0  
92

93 Present: Peter, Green, Lee, Reade, Caesar, Hamedi-Hagh, Marachi, Hwang  
94

95 Absent: White, Kauppila  
96

97 Financial Impact: There is a possibility that a small number of faculty may be promoted a  
98 year or two earlier than they otherwise would be, leading to higher salary costs. There is  
99 also a possibility that this will help us to recruit and retain promising faculty, leading to  
100 fewer failed searches and lower attrition, which would have cost savings.  
101

102 Workload Impact: No direct impacts.  
103

104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138

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

.....  
5.0 Appointment letters

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

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

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

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

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

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

6 **Policy Recommendation**  
7 **Final Examinations, Evaluations, or Culminating**  
8 **Activities Policy**  
9

10  
11 Legislative history: Replaces S06-4

12  
13 Whereas: University policy S06-4 requires that all classes have a final  
14 examination or other appropriate culminating activity at the  
15 scheduled final examination time; and

16  
17 Whereas: There is concern that some faculty have taken it upon themselves  
18 to reschedule exams to times that are not allowed by current policy,  
19 including during the regular semester or "Study/Conference Day,"  
20 to the disadvantage of students; and

21  
22 Whereas: The choice of appropriate culminating experience is a curricular  
23 matter that rightly belongs to the faculty; therefore be it

24  
25 Resolved: that the policy statement below be adopted as university policy on  
26 final examinations, evaluations, or culminating activities.  
27

28  
29 Final Examinations, Evaluations, or Culminating Activities Policy  
30

31  
32 Faculty members are required to have a culminating activity for their courses,  
33 which can include a final examination, a final research paper or project, a final  
34 creative work or performance, a final portfolio of work, or other appropriate  
35 assignment.  
36

37  
38 Time Frame for Culminating Activities:

39  
40 In the case where there is to be a timed, sit down final examination or an  
41 online synchronous final, it must occur during the scheduled final  
42 examination time for that course. The required submission date and time  
43 for take-home examinations, final papers or other culminating activities

44 must fall no earlier than the first day of the final examination period. Online  
45 asynchronous final exams are to be treated like take-home exams. Final  
46 exams shall not be given, nor culminating activities due, during regularly  
47 scheduled class periods or on "Study/Conference Day." Supervision and  
48 individual study courses (180, 184, 297, 298, 299) are not required to  
49 have a culminating activity.  
50

#### 51 Exceptions to Time Frame for Culminating Activities:

52  
53 Exceptions for the above time frame are justified in the following  
54 circumstances:  
55

- 56 a. Performance courses in which it is impractical to examine each  
57 student individually in the time period assigned for final  
58 examinations; e.g. performance courses in theater arts, music,  
59 or athletics.  
60

61 Circumstances in which students may request the rescheduling of a  
62 culminating activity:  
63

- 64 a. A student may request the rescheduling of a culminating activity  
65 if there is a verifiable emergency.
- 66 b. A student may request the rescheduling of a culminating  
67 activity if three or more are scheduled/due within a 24-hour  
68 period. Requests must be made at least three weeks prior to  
69 the last class meeting of the semester.
  - 70 i. If one of the three or more culminating activities  
71 scheduled for the same day is a paper or project, the  
72 deadline for the paper/project will be moved to a  
73 mutually agreeable time within the final examination  
74 period.
  - 75 ii. If three or more finals are scheduled on the same day,  
76 the student may request an alternative exam date  
77 and/or time from any one of the instructors.
  - 78 iii. If an alternate time for a regularly scheduled final  
79 exam period cannot be arranged between the student  
80 and the instructor, the rescheduled exam will be taken  
81 during the final exam-makeup period.
- 82 c. In the case of either a verifiable emergency or the student  
83 having more than two culminating activities scheduled within a  
84 24 hour period: if a student and instructor are unable to reach  
85 agreement on rescheduling, the chair will first be consulted. If  
86 no agreement can be found through the chair, the dean (or  
87 designee) will be consulted.  
88  
89

90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114

Oversight of Culminating Activities

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

Approved: November 14, 2016

Vote: 16-0-0

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

Financial Impact: None

Workload Impact: Small workload addition for chairs to educate and consult with faculty members about appropriate culminating experiences.

1 **San José State University**  
2 **Academic Senate**  
3 **Organization and Government Committee**  
4 **February 13, 2017**  
5 **Final Reading**

**AS 1645**

6  
7 **Policy Recommendation**  
8 **Rescinds S82-10 and F86-7 Pertaining to**  
9 **Technology-Related Advisory Boards**

10  
11  
12 Legislative History: Rescinds S82-10 (established the information systems and  
13 computing advisory board) and F86-7 (added a member to the information  
14 systems and computing advisory board).

15  
16 Whereas: The Information Systems and Computing Advisory Board was  
17 dissolved in 1998 (S98-9) and replaced with a CIO Advisory Board,  
18 and

19  
20 Whereas: The CIO Advisory Board was dissolved in 2000 (S00-5), and

21  
22 Whereas: At that time, earlier policies pertaining to the Information Systems  
23 and Computing Advisory Board were overlooked, therefore, be it

24  
25 Resolved: That S82-10 and F86-7 be rescinded.

26  
27  
28 Rationale: This corrects an oversight and rescinds policies related to committees  
29 which no longer exists.

30  
31  
32  
33 Approved: 2/6/17

34 Vote: 7-0-1

35 Present: Laker, Shifflett, Boekema, Rajkovic, Hart, Grosvenor,  
36 Ormsbee, Tran

37 Absent: Bailey, Higgins

38 Financial Impact: None

39 Workload Impact: None

40