SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE

2016/2017

Agenda

March 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 February 13, 2017

III. Communications and Questions:

A. From the Chair of the Senate

B. From the President

IV. State of the University Announcements:

A. Provost
B. Vice President for Student Affairs
C. Vice President for Administration and Finance
D. Vice President for University Advancement
E. Chief Diversity Officer
F. Statewide Academic Senators
G. Associated Students President

V. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee –

Executive Committee Minutes of February 6, 2017
Executive Committee Minutes of February 20, 2017

B. Consent Calendar –

Consent Calendar of March 13, 2017

C. Executive Committee Action Items –

VI. New Business:

Spartans supporting Spartans Coffee Break, Time Certain: 3:30 p.m.

VII. Unfinished Business:

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

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

AS 1641, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy S16-14: Clarification of 'Internship' (Final Reading)

B. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
AS 1637, Policy Recommendation, Required Enrollment for Culminating Graduate Students (Final Reading)

AS 1648, Policy Recommendation, Graduate Student Revalidation of Courses that Exceed the 7-Year Limit (First Reading)

C. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
AS 1643, Policy Recommendation, Amendment C to S15-6, Appointment of Regular Faculty Employees; Consideration for Early Tenure for Previously Tenured Faculty (Final Reading)

AS 1646, Policy Recommendation, Selection and Review of Department Chairs (First Reading)

AS 1647, Policy Recommendation, Rescinding and Replacing F97-7 University Policy on Privacy of Electronic Information (First Reading)

D. Organization and Government Committee (O&G)
AS 1629, Policy Recommendation, Concurrent Membership on Operating and Policy Committees (Final Reading)

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

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

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

E. University Library Board (ULB):

IX. Special Committee Reports:

X. Adjournment:

2016/2017 Academic Senate

MINUTES
February 13, 2017

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

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

Deans:
Present: Stacks, Jacobs, Schutten, Green

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

Alumni Representative:
Present: Walters
Absent: None

Emeritus Representative:
Present: Buzanski
Absent: None

Honorary Representative:
Present: Lessow-Hurley

General Unit Representatives:
Present: Matoush, Higgins, Trousdale, Kauppila

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

COB Representatives:
Present: Reade, Rodan
Absent: Campsey

EDUC Representatives:
Present: Laker, Mathur
Absent: None

ENGR Representatives:
Present: Chung, Hamedi-Hagh

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

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

SOS Representatives:
Present: Peter, Wilson, Trulio, Hart

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

The minutes of December 12, 2016 were approved as written (46-0-0).

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate—

Chair Kimbarow announced that Senator Sabalius was one of three finalists for the Faculty Trustee seat on the Board of Trustees. The Senate congratulated Senator Sabalius.

Chair Kimbarow thanked the Vice Chair and Senate Administrator for their hard work on the Senate Retreat on January 27, 2017.

The Spartans Supporting Spartans Campaign will be starting their campaign on March 13, 2017, and will be at the Senate meeting on that date during the break.

There will be an Essence of Blackness event in the Student Union at 5:30 p.m. also on March 13, 2017. The Senate meeting ends at 5 p.m. that day, and the event is right next door at the Student Union.

The Senate Elections for Spring 2017 have begun. Nominating petitions are due in the Senate Office no later than Friday, February 24, 2017.

B. From the President—

President Papazian congratulated Senator Sabalius on being a finalist for the Faculty Trustee position.

Many of us are concerned about the recent suicide in the MLK Library. This is a very complicated issue. We are working with the city to address the issues and see what kind of measures we can take to prevent this in the future. President Papazian commended the MLK Library staff for addressing very difficult circumstances. President Papazian also thanked the counseling staff for their efforts after this tragic event.

President Papazian congratulated the CSU Statewide Senate on what she thought was a wonderful meeting this past Thursday and Friday. It was one of those meetings where everyone from the Chancellor and the Chancellor's team came together with the faculty leadership from across the CSU. Significant issues were addressed.

The search for the new VP and CIO will be launced on February 17, 2017. Michael Kaufman will be chair of the search committee.

The decision about whether the Bart station will be on the West side at San Carlos and 2nd Street, or the East side at 4th Street and San Carlos will be made by the VTA Board at their September 7, 2017 meeting. However, the recommendation from their staff to the VTA Board will be made in July 2017. This is the time for SJSU to get our recommendation considered.

President Papazian is exploring a homebuyers program for the neighborhood around the university.

There is a gap in the budget approved by the Board of Trustees and what the Governor has proposed. The UC Board recently passed a tuition increase. Our Board of Trustees would like to avoid this if possible.

We are paying attention to the issues around immigration. We have a large number of faculty, staff, and students that could be impacted by the Executive Order from

President Trump. Fortunately, most of our students were already here prior to the passing of the Executive Order. We are advising any faculty, staff, and students not to leave if they are from one of the countries on the list.

President Papazian has scheduled meetings with faculty from all colleges in an effort to understand their issues. She has already met with the Engineering faculty.

Questions:
Q: Regarding the recent suicide in the MLK Library, tomorrow is Valentines Day and many of us are wondering if there are any special plans for suicide prevention in the MLK Library? Also, I received a notice that there is a 19 story student housing tower being built between 2nd and 3rd street, and in the same week I read that Camera 12 is going to be student housing. I'm confused because at one point we couldn't even fill student housing and now we have two new projects?
A: The first project at the site of the old McDonalds is a private developer project by Barry Swenson, and it is a 1,000 bed unit that they are calling "The Graduate." We have no control over what private developers do, but we are talking with them about this right now. We have 4,000 beds on our campus and 35,000 students. That is not a good balance. We need more beds. Whether we build it, or someone else builds it, we just need to make sure it is suitable. Sobrato also has another tower over on the other side of the Hammer Theatre. Then there is the Camera 12 facility which is being sold and we are currently one of the players in that.

Q: There have been a lot of reports that anyone that is foreign born, even with a green card, as well as some U.S. born people being harassed when they return from other countries. In addition to a course monitoring what is being proposed, we need to have procedures in place that allow for extensions for dropping and adding classes for our international students. Shouldn't we have alerts to tell us if students from a particular region are being targeted, etc.?
A: The President appreciates the care and support for students our faculty is showing. However, it may not be the best idea to have a running commentary about how many students from what country are being treated badly. University personnel will let you know if a student in your class has an issue. These are serious issues and we have to handle this in a way that does not compromise our students. Some students do not want to be identified and just want to go to class.

Q: Regarding the CIO Search, can you give us dates for campus visits?
A: President Papazian commented that she did not have the schedule with her. However, it will happen before the summer so faculty will have a chance to meet candidates.

Q: On the question of housing downtown, when this was first announced in the San José Mercury News it sounded like this was campus housing. People in the downtown area thought this was SJSU housing. SJSU has a brand. If something goes down in these housing units it might look like it is SJSU's fault, even if it isn't our housing. We should be careful that these projects aren't being announced as

SJSU housing.
A: We have gotten involved since this occurred. We weren't having these conversations before this year and people thought they could do whatever they wanted. Barry Swenson thought he was doing us a favor. President Papazian has met with him since, and he is onboard with considering our ideas.

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

A. Associated Students President –

On March 1, 2017 AS will host their 150th anniversary celebration on Tower Lawn.

AS created a fund for departments/programs on campus that were typically underserved including MOSAIC, Pride, Gender Equity Center, etc. Our first event in support of this fund is being held today right after this Senate meeting.

Another event that AS is promoting is called, "Riding in Cars with Black People." This event talks about interracial upbringing and all the different experiences that people with interracial families typically deal with.

AS is also hosting an event to prepare gift boxes for our troops. Campus and local media will be invited.

AS is having a hygiene products and food drive that started last month and is continuing until February 28, 2017.

AS has scholarships available and applications are due May 1, 2017.

AS is filling two vacant Board of Director seats right now.

Questions:

Q: Has AS considered partnering with any of the local law schools to help undocumented students?
A: Yes, we are looking into that.
A: President Papazian announced that she has established a resource center for Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) students on campus. There have also been events and attorneys on campus to assist students from some of the non-profits.

B. Chief Diversity Officer (CDO)–

The CDO has been holding support groups for faculty to talk about what has been going on in their classrooms, etc. Generally, the atmosphere is very good. Faculty are focusing very hard on how to help their students. The CDO will continue to hold these support groups. One staff support group was held and attended by about 35 staff members as well.

The CDO has just finished meeting with the last team about orientation across all three platforms of students—freshmen, transfers, and graduate/international students. The CDO will be including a standardized two-hour diversity, inclusion, and equity training across all three platforms. There will also be Title IX training.

The CDO has been working with the Vice President for University Advancement to create a website that should be going live soon.

The CDO is working on a bias/discrimination incident report form. This is a requirement. This should be live in the next couple of weeks.

There has been a change in the Title IX Executive Orders regarding students training on campus. We are now required to give annual training to all students.

The Title IX Officer, Natalie Potts, and the CDO have asked that every college submit the name of one person from the college to be trained as the college's Title IX liaison. There will be a mass training for all of these personnel.

The CDO is participating with the WASC team to evaluate what has been done with regard to campus climate.

The CDO has also been reviewing faculty diversity research proposals. This was done in conjunction with the Center for Faculty Development.

The CDO has two faculty-in-residence, Susan Murray and Soma de Bourbon.

Question:
Q: You were speaking about a bias reporting mechanism, what is the plan for summary reporting and the distribution of those summary reports?
A: The CDO will be putting together some regular reports on these issues, but has not had a chance to do this yet. However, that is the plan. There have also been questions about the President's Commission on Diversity. That commission has been officially closed. A new commission will be established to advise the President in the future.

C. CSU Statewide Senators –

The Academic Senate California State University (ASCSU) has been very busy since you last heard from us. The ASCSU passes resolutions and not policy proposals, but the intention is to prompt action by the CSU. The first resolution involves a resolution in support of a letter the Chancellor wrote supporting DACA.

The ASCSU also passed a resolution encouraging each campus to review

existing lactation resource policies, and to develop and implement policies if none exist.

The ASCSU passed a resolution in opposition to our new Secretary of Education.

The ASCSU gave advice to the CSU regarding its tenure density task force. SJSU has one of the worst tenure density in the CSU system.

The Senate vigorously debated the proposed tuition increse under consideration by the Board of Trustees. Senator Sabalius actually proposed an amendment to eliminate tuition.

There was a presentation by the Vice Chancellor General Counsel about what we can do and cannot do to protect free speech.

The ASCSU spent a lot of time on Academic Freedom and approved a draft policy. The issue at hand seems to be that the CSU sees the Academic Senate as an external body to the CSU and says we are not allowed to discuss this under the collective bargaining agreeement.

Things to look for in the future include a resolution to provide employment security for lecturers in the CSU.

There is also a sentiment that we need to stop using a passing grade in the area of B4 as evidence of passing the ELM requirement. The ASCSU is also a little concerned that C- is now a passing grade for the golden four. We requested that it return to a "C," but the Chancellor has said it will be a C-.

There was also a wonderful academic conference. The topic was, "Closing the Achievement Gap." This was a very well done conference.

D. Provost –

We will be starting our call for nominations for the AVP for Student and Faculty Success Search Committee this week. This will be an internal search.

The Provost was at the Student Success Summit on ~~Feburary~~February 3, 2017 and it was a great success. There were over 30 principals and superintendents from our community discussing remediation challenges. We came up with five or six ideas and hope to come up with several pilot programs. We had a number of Assemblymen there as well.

Today we kicked off the Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA) Advisory Council. We now have a group from all the colleges talking about what RSCA means on this campus and ways we can improve opportunities for our faculty and students to engage in research, scholarship, and creative

activities.

Provost Feinstein and VP Blaylock spent about ~~four~~ two hours talking with new Provosts and VPs of Student Affairs about how Academic Affairs and Student Affairs can work together more effectively.

The Provost and VP of Student Affairs will host the 2nd Annual Interdivisional Competition this year on Febuary 25, 2017. This is at our women's basketball game. There will be food and pre-game activities and challenges.

E. Vice President of Finance and Administration –

The newsletter sent out last week from the Administration and Finance Division has the campus safety plan in it. Please take a look at it. This will also be on the website within a week.

As for student housing, those fees come out of the student fees and not state funding. When Campus Village 2 (CV2) went up that was student funding. If we have a hand in the design of buildings built around the campus by local contractors, then we might be able to purchase some of this housing down the road if it meets our specifications.

Questions:

Q: We had to require freshmen to live in housing in the past in order to meet our payments, and we are a little concerned that we make sure we are able to make use of all the housing we build and acquire.
A: Absolutely, we need to make sure there is a demand for it. We haven't signed any agreements with anyone, we are just talking with the local contractors about the design.

Q: At a previous institution where I worked, we would have a private company build the on campus housing on campus. Is that something we are considering here?
A: That is exactly what is happening here, except this is off campus housing built on the developer's land.

Q: I have forensic science equipment that is student funded, so what does that mean?
A: Students pay fees and part of those fees go to service the debt for student housing.
Q: Why are we making a difference in where the funds come from? Isn't it all from student fees, so why don't we call it all university funds?
A: Because the legislature requires it.
A: President Papazian commented that this is a way of being clear about exactly where the funding is coming from. There is certain criteria about what fees can be used for what purpose and we can be audited on this. You are right when you say we are talking about the cost of atttendance to a student and it

includes tuition and fees for books as well as other student fees.
A: However, the students back in 2007 approved an increase in student fees to pay for the Student Union, the Recreation Building, and the Wellness Center. Those fees were collected starting after student approval and are being used to pay the debt for those buildings. Once those buildings are completed these fees will no longer be collected.

Q: What plans do you have for where the bookstore used to be?
A: The CIES group is moving into the Student Union from 4th Street in early June 2017.

F. Vice President for Student Affairs – No report.

V. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

EC Minutes of November 28, 2016 – No questions.
EC Minutes of December 5, 2016 – No questions.
EC Minutes of January 11, 2017 – No questions.
EC Minutes of January 30, 2017 – No questions.

B. Consent Calendar –

The consent calendar of February 13, 2017 was approved as amended by AVC Schultz-Krohn (46-0-0).

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

The Senate Calendar of 2017-2018 was approved as written (34-0-1).

VI. New Business – None.

VII. Unfinished Business: None.

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

A. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) –

Senator Kaufman presented AS 1644, Policy Recommendation, Final Examinations, or Culminating Activities Policy (Final Reading).

Senator Kaufman presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to remove, "(180, 184, 297, 298, 299)" on line 48. Senator Peter presented an amendment to replace, "first day of the final examination period" on line 44 with "beginning of the scheduled final examination time for the course." Senator Lee presented an amendment to the Peter amendment to change it to read, "beginning of the scheduled culminating activity for the course." The Lee amendment to the Peter amendment was not seconded. **The Peter amendment passed (24-9-2).** Senator

Sabalius presented an amendment to reverse the change made to b. iii. as shown now to what it read at the first reading. The Sabalius amendment was seconded. Senator Sabalius withdrew his amendment. Senator Laker presented an amendment to change "c. In the case of either a verifiable emergency or the student..." to read, "c. In the case of either a verifiable emergency or accommodation request or the student...," and also to make the same change to "a." The Laker amendment failed (13-15-6). Senator Van Selst presented an amendment to line 60 to add, "b. Other such circumstances as approved by the chair with notification and rationale to be provided to the dean**." The Van Selst amendment passed (34-0-5)**. Senator J. Lee presented an amendment to line 48 to replace, "are not required to have a culminating activity" with "are exempt from this policy." The Lee amendment failed (1-36-3). Senator Frazier made a motion to refer the policy resolution back to committee to resolve the question of when the final paper is due, what the final day of the semester is, and what the final exam days will be." The Frazier motion failed (9-22-5). Senator Buzanski called the question. **The Buzanksi motion passed (28-3-4). <u>The Senate voted on AS 1644 as amended and it passed (25-5-4).</u>**

B. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –
Senator Peter presented ***AS 1633, Policy Recommendation, Adopting New SOTE and SOLATE Instruments (Final Reading).***
<u>The Senate voted on AS 1633 and it passed as written (33-1-1).</u>

C. Organization and Government Committee (O&G) –
Senator Shifflett presented ***AS 1645, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds S82-10 and F86-7 Pertaining to Technology-Related Advisory Board (Final Reading).*** **<u>The Senate voted on AS 1645 and it passed as written (28-0-1).</u>**

D. University Library Board (ULB) – None.

E. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) –
Senator Mathur presented ***AS 1641, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy S16-14, Clarification of 'Internship' (Final Reading).*** Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to add a new Resolved clause to read, "Resolved that responsibility for the renewal of UOAs rests with the Office of Student and Faculty Success in consultation with the originating department." The Shifflett amendment was seconded. Provost Feinstein suggested that before responsibility for renewal of UOAs is assigned to one of his offices, he and the Curriculum and Research Committee should meet and discuss this**. In light of the Provost's comments, Senator Buzanski made a motion to adjourn and resume debate at the next meeting. <u>The Senate voted and the Buzanski motion passed (24-6-0)</u>**.

IX. Special Committee Reports – None

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Executive Committee Meeting
February 6, 2017
12-1:30, ADM 167

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

Absent: Blaylock

1. The minutes of January 30, 2017 were approved as amended by Provost Feinstein, Senator Mathur, Senator Frazier, and President Papazian (14-0-0).

2. The consent calendar of January 30, 2017 was approved as written (14-0-0).

3. Senate Calendar of 2017-2018. The Executive Committee discussed two versions of the Senate calendar. The first version was presented by Vice Chair Frazier (see version A attached), and the second version was presented by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, (see version B).

   The Executive Committee discussed the differences between each calendar. Calendar A had three policy committee meetings and four weeks before the first Senate meeting and then one week between each of three Senate meetings in the Fall. Vice Chair Frazier explained that this would give the policy committees more time to get resolutions ready for the first Senate meeting. Calendar B spread out the Senate meetings to allow for a more equal amount of time between meetings to give the Senate Administrator sufficient time to prepare for each meeting. Calendar B also moved the Senate meeting the Monday before Thanksgiving to the next Monday to allow for those individuals that take the whole week off. Vice Chair Frazier explained that the Monday before the Senate meeting was still a duty day for faculty.

   Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to version A of the calendar that was friendly to the committee to move the Senate meeting from September 25, 2017 to September 18, 2017. The Executive Committee did not consider version B of the calendar and voted to approve version A of the calendar as amended by Senator Shifflett (9-0-5).

4. Updates:

   a. From the Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
      The C&R Committee will be bringing the Internship policy for a final reading at the February 13, 2017 Senate meeting. C&R is also working on the Program Planning Guidelines.

   b. From the Chair of the Professional Standards Committee (PS):
      The PS Committee will be bringing a policy on early tenure, and a chairs/directors policy for first readings at the February 13, 2017 Senate meeting. The SOTE policy will be coming back for a final reading this meeting. The Information Privacy policy is on hold. The President may approach this issue with a Presidential Directive. Finally, the PS Committee will be surveying the campus to collect information from program coordinators.

c. From the Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
O&G will be bringing a policy to remove obsolete policies that were missed. The concurrent membership on policy and operating committees proposal will come back for a final reading at the February 13, 2017 meeting.

O&G is hosting voting rights open forums next week and hopes to have a policy ready for a first reading at the March Senate meeting.

O&G will also be bringing the Selection and Review of Administrators policy to the Senate for a first reading, and the Student Success Committee policy for a final reading at the February 13, 2017 meeting.

d. From the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
I&SA will be bringing the Final Exam and Continuous Enrollment for Graduate Students in RP Status policies to the Senate for final readings at the February 13, 2017 meeting. In addition, I&SA will also be bringing back the Priority Registration policy for a first reading.

e. From the Chair of the Senate:
The Senate Chair will be leading a discussion at the February 13, 2017 Senate Meeting on how we envision the strategic planning process for campus outreach, and transparency, etc. The Strategic Planning Committee would like to get feedback from all faculty and staff on strategic planning and will be hosting walk-in coffee/breakfast events in the near future. Last week Kathy Wong(Lau), the CDO, and VP Blaylock tracked down the goal groups from the past to get information from them.

5. The Faculty Diversity Taskforce has met approximately 5 times since last October. Each of these meetings was about 2 hours long. The Faculty Diversity Committee (FDC) reports to the PS Committee. Until Proposition 209, there was an Affirmative Action Committee (this committee was merged with the Affirmative Action Committee in 2005—SM-S05-6). The FDC is suggesting they become a group such as the Faculty-in-Residence to assist on all searches in the university and to act as an advisory body for the CDO.

6. Updates:

a. **From the President**:
International students, faculty, and staff are impacted by the Executive Order from President Trump. SJSU is researching Letters of Intent such as from the ACLU that we can use. Dean Huard is providing outreach to our international students.

The President and VP Faas attended a meeting this morning at VTA regarding the proposed location of the downtown San Jose BART station.

Students have been very articulate around the issue of tuition increases. The CSU is working hard to try and not put the burden on our students.

The President has been taking “listening tours” of the colleges to hear what people on campus have to say and understand their concerns.

The CIO Search is ready to launch. The President is also considering a new VP of Research and Innovation position.

b. **From the Provost**: No report.

c. **From the Vice President of Administration and Finance (VPAF)**: No report.

d. **From the Associated Students President (AS)**:
AS will be celebrating their 120th year Anniversary this year.

AS is working to fill two vacancies on their Board of Directors by February 22, 2017.

AS will be hosting a workshop series aimed at encouraging students to go to graduate school.

AS is hosting, "Riding in Cars with Black People," at 6 p.m. on Monday, February 13, 2017 in the Student Union.

AS recently held their Spring Welcome event for students.

7. The meeting adjourned at 1:34 p.m.

These minutes were taken and transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice on February 6, 2017. The minutes were edited by Chair Kimbarow on February 16, 2017. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on February 20, 2017.

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

Fall 2017		Spring 2018	
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.)
Sept. 18	**Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)**	**Feb. 12**	**Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)**
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)
Oct. 9	**Senate Meeting (2-4 p.m.) (AA and University Budget)**	**Mar. 12**	**Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)**
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.)
Oct. 23	**Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)**	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.)	**Apr. 9**	**Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)**
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.)
Nov. 20	**Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)**		
Nov. 27	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meetings (2-4 p.m.)	**April 30**	**Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)**
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.)
Dec. 11	**Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)**	**May 14**	**Senate Meeting (2-4 p.m. Last of 2016-17)** **Senate Meeting (4-5 p.m. First of 2017-18)**
	Meeting Locations: All Senate meetings held in Engr. 285/287; Exec. Meetings held in ADM 167; Policy Committees – check with Senate Office		Senate Retreat: TBD

Approved by Executive Committee February 6, 2017

Approved by Senate February 13, 2017

(Version B, Eva's version of calendar)

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

Fall 2017		Spring 2018	
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.)
Sept. 18	**Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)**	**Feb. 12**	**Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)**
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)
Oct. 9	**Senate Meeting (2-4 p.m.) (AA and University Budget)**	**Mar. 12**	**Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)**
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.)
Oct. 23	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meeting (2-4 p.m.)	Apr. 2	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meeting (2-4 p.m.)
Oct. 30	**Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)**	**Apr. 9**	**Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)**
Nov. 6	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) 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.)
Nov. 27	**Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)**		
		April 30	**Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)**
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.)
Dec. 11	Executive Committee Meeting (12-1:30 p.m.) Policy Committee Meetings (2-4 p.m.)	**May 14**	**Senate Meeting (2-4 p.m. Last of 2016-17)** **Senate Meeting (4-5 p.m. First of 2017-18)**
Dec. 18	**Senate Meeting (2-5 p.m.)** **Meeting Locations:** All Senate meetings held in Engr. 285/287; Exec. Meetings held in ADM 167; Policy Committees – check with Senate Office		Senate Retreat: TBD

Approved by Executive Committee_____

Approved by Senate_____

C&R meets SH 331, PS meets SLIS 445, I&SA meets CLK 412, O&G meets CLK 349, ULB meets MLK Boardroom

Executive Committee Meeting
February 20, 2017
12-1:30, ADM 167

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

Absent: Riley

1. The minutes of February 6, 2017 were approved as amended by Senator Shifflett and Vice Chair Frazier (14-0-0).

2. The consent calendar of February 20, 2017 was approved as written (14-0-0).

3. Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC):
The committee discussed faculty nominees for one vacant seat on the Strategic Planning Steering Committee.

4. Senate Meeting Management:
Chair Kimbarow discussed procedures to avoid spending two hours on one resolution as occurred during the last Senate meeting. Suggestions included limiting questions and answers on first readings as well as the question period during final readings. Another suggestion included limiting the comments from the President and Senate Chair to 10 to 15 minutes.

   There will be two reports at the April Senate meeting including a faculty diversity report by AVP Elna Green, and a report from the FAR and the Athletics Board.

5. WASC Report:
The committee discussed campus changes and the improved shared governance environment since the last WASC visit. The committee discussed numerous examples of shared governance successes since the last visit.

6. Vision 2017:
Chair Kimbarow and Provost Feinstein will be hosting Town Hall meetings to give the campus a chance to weigh in on issues related to strategic planning and what aspects have been successful in the past. They would like input from the campus on these and other issues such as where the campus should go from here as far as diversity, etc.

7. Updates:

   a. From the Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
   Voting Rights for Faculty Policy:
   A summary from the open forums O&G recently held pertaining to faculty voting rights, as well as their meeting with the UCCD was provided. While there is consensus on giving departments the flexibility to craft their own guidelines for lecturer voting rights on curriculum and other matters, there is disagreement on what the default should be in the area of curriculum. The committee discussed whether there would be a need to pay lecturers if we are asking them to vote on curriculum matters. The committee also discussed if people without a terminal degree should be making decisions on curriculum.

Selection and Review of Administrators Policy:
The committee discussed how search and review committees could be reviewed for diversity. Options included review after the nomination process, but before elections; after elections and before final appointments by the Provost; or reviews both before and after elections. A member suggested a "jury pool" type selection process for members.

b. From the Provost:
The Provost indicated that changes to the faculty awards policy could be needed. The process is so much work that many superior faculty members are never nominated. The Provost would like to make this process more celebratory and the process less complicated. A suggestion was made to get the deans more involved. A suggestion was also that the Provost charge the administrators that chair these selection committees each year in an effort to instruct them on how he would like the selections setup and forwarded to the President.

c. From the AS President:
AS will host their AS 55 Awards event on March 10, 2017.

AS will host a black faculty, staff, and student mixer on March 13, 2017 from 4 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. in the Student Union.

8. The meeting adjourned at 1:38 p.m.

These minutes were taken and transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice on February 20, 2017. The minutes were edited by Chair Kimbarow on March 1, 2017. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on March 6, 2017.

Consent Calendar 13-Mar-17

Committee	Last Name/First Name	Term	Phone	Seat/College
Committee on Committees	Park, Young	2018	924-7854	CoE
Program Planning	Sunada, Dwight	2019	408-235-0741	CoE
	best contact for Dwight is through email: dwight.sunada@sjsu.edu			
REMOVE:				
BAFPR	Osland, Asbjorn			COB

San José State University
Academic Senate
Organization and Government Committee **AS 1621**
March 13, 2017
Final Reading

Policy Recommendation
Departmental Voting Rights

Legislative History: Rescinds F66-6 related to voting privileges for faculty on leave. Rescinds F02-4 and S98-2, both of which pertained to departmental voting rights. F02-4 arose from deliberations about whether and how lecturers may participate in the nomination and selection of department chairs, and a concern that the previous policy (S98-2) appeared to exclude lecturers from such participation. Rescinds F07-5 regarding voting privileges for faculty assigned to more than one representative unit.

Whereas, The voting rights associated with decisions relating to policies/bylaws/ guidelines, curricula, and other business of academic departments requires clarification; and

Whereas, Meaningful engagement of departmental faculty in decision making is an essential component of shared governance, assuring the integrity of departmental business, and our commitments to students; now, therefore, be it

Resolved: That S98-2, F07-5 and F66-6 be replaced by this policy, and be it further

Resolved: That the administration, in consultation with the Senate, investigate options and subsequently acquire an appropriate resource to facilitate online voting at all levels (department, college, university), and be it further

Resolved: That the attached policy be implemented following approval by the President, and be it further

Resolved: That until such time as S14-8 (selection & review of department chairs) is updated, section 1.a. of F02-4 will remain in effect while all other provisions of F02-4 will be replaced by this policy. Thus, lecturer votes related to department chair recommendations remain advisory. S14-8 is presently under revision by Professional Standards. Once their work is completed, this section of F02-4 will become obsolete.

1.a. Names for inclusion in the list of qualified (tenured or probationary) faculty to serve as department chair may be recommended by all regular and temporary faculty in the department. Normally, a department meeting shall be held at which persons whose names are proposed as chair shall be open for discussion, and all regular and temporary faculty may attend

and participate. All faculty may then vote by secret ballot (proportional votes for part-time faculty, as provided below) on all candidates proposed and willing to serve. The name or names of those receiving a majority vote of the regular (tenured and probationary) faculty shall be forwarded to the President via the College Dean as the nominee(s) of the department. A statement of the vote of all faculty, broken down into two categories – vote by regular faculty and by temporary faculty, including the actual number of votes cast in each category - will be forwarded to the President via the College Dean for information.

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

Retention of section 1.a. of F02-4 is needed to temporarily bridge the gap between rescinding F02-4 and update of S14-8 (selection & review of department chairs). Subsequently the revision of S14-8 will contain all information regarding department chair nomination and selection procedures.

Note: Regarding department chair assignments, the current CSU/CFA Agreement states that:

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

Approved:	3/6/17
Vote:	8-1-0
Present:	Bailey, Boekema, Grosvenor, Hart, Higgins, Laker, Ormsbee, Shifflett, Tran
Absent:	Rajkovic
Financial Impact:	Depending on decisions regarding tools for online voting, one-time costs for the purchase of software can be expected.
Workload Impact:	Potential reduction as a result of the clarification of processes and potential prevention of time consuming corrections resulting from

inappropriate procedures. Potential increase initially depending on departmental time invested in development of their bylaws/guidelines related to voting rights.

Departmental Voting Rights

The ideals of higher education within the United States are rooted in principles of democracy and shared governance. This policy affirms the primacy of faculty members in decision-making related to the academic and educational matters of departments. The voting rights described in this policy exclude all personnel matters. Separate policies govern (including voting procedures) Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (S15-7) and the Selection and Review of Department Chairs (S14-8).

Overall, engagement in deliberations prior to voting should be the norm as it leads to more informed decision making. Additionally, those leading departments and/or committees should strive to make agendas and supporting materials available in a reasonable time in advance of meetings and seek the input of all faculty on matters related to their roles and responsibilities.

1. Definitions

1.1 Departmental voting rights are the rights granted to faculty to have a voice, through voting, on matters pertaining to their roles and responsibilities in the department(s) they are formally affiliated with, including but not limited to governance, curriculum, and leadership.

~~1.1.1 Engagement in deliberations prior to voting should be the norm as it leads to more informed decision making.~~

~~1.1.2 Those leading departments and/or committees should strive to make agendas and supporting materials available in a reasonable time in advance of meetings.~~

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

~~1.3 Formal vote. A formal vote is one taken following a motion, a second to the motion, and discussion preceding a vote. Unless otherwise stipulated by the department's tenured and tenure track faculty, Roberts rules of order shall apply.~~

2. Department Faculty Voting

2.1 Those eligible to vote are those who have departmental voting rights in the area(s) being voted on.

2.2 In order to provide flexibility at the department level with regard to departmental voting, departmental guidelines/bylaws shall ~~can~~ be established by tenured and tenure track faculty to stipulate ~~clarify~~ lecturers' departmental voting rights (proportional to their

assignment) on some or all department issues excluding those assigned to tenured and tenure track faculty by university policy or departmental guidelines/bylaws.

2.2.1. Given variations in the culture, history, and composition of departments with regard to tenure density, differences in the extent to which lecturers will be engaged in decision making are expected. In establishing departmental guidelines/bylaws pertaining to ~~matters which~~ lecturers voting rights ~~vote on~~, departments may ~~might~~ take into consideration a range of issues including, but not limited to, years of experience, terminal degrees and other qualifications, entitlements, years of service in the department, and appointment level (e.g., .2, .5, 1.0)

2.2.2 Departmental voting rights, when granted, take effect at the beginning of the next semester (fall or spring) and remain in effect until departmental voting guidelines/bylaws are modified. When department guidelines/bylaws pertaining to departmental voting are modified, the changes go into effect at the beginning of the next semester.

2.2.3 Departments may not require lecturers to serve on committees in order to obtain voting rights since appointments for lecturers typically do not include service requirements.

2.2.4 When a department establishes a committee responsible for making preliminary decisions on departmental matters, department guidelines/bylaws can grant a full vote (rather than proportional) to all members of such committees regardless of their proportional assignment in the department.

2.3 Voting, unless otherwise stipulated in department guidelines/bylaws or university policy, is restricted to ~~by~~ tenured and tenure track faculty in these areas~~: is required for the nomination of department chairs (S14-8);~~ merging, dividing, transferring, or eliminating academic units (S13-9); and department name changes.

2.4 Voting, unless otherwise stipulated in department guidelines/bylaws or university policy, is restricted to ~~by~~ tenured and tenure track faculty in these areas: ~~is required for the~~ development of and/or changes to departmental curricula, curricular policies, and program requirements for students (inclusive of establishing or modifying courses).

2.4.1 Depending on a department's guidelines/bylaws, ~~structure and size~~, voting may be conducted by: (a) representative committees; (b) tenured and tenure track faculty only; or (c) all department faculty (lecturers, tenured, tenure track) faculty when ~~the entire faculty in a department if~~ voting rights related to curriculum have been granted to lecturers. ~~in department guidelines/bylaws – per 2.2 above)~~

2.4.1.1 When a department establishes a committee responsible for

making curricular decisions, faculty members with voting rights on curricular matters ~~a faculty member~~ not on the curriculum committee may request a review of a specific committee decision. This request must be voted on and approved by the department faculty with voting rights on curricular matters in order for a committee decision to be reviewed.

2.5 Departments may choose to vote (or not vote) on a range of matters beyond those specified in sections 2.3 and 2.4. However, faculty voting rights do not extend to matters that may contravene university policies, violate the Collective Bargaining Agreement, interfere with departmental management and participation in university governance, or fall under the responsibilities of the department chair or equivalent.

3. Voting Methods and Procedures.

3.1 Tenured and tenure track faculty will determine the acceptable methods, mechanisms and timelines for voting (e.g., paper ballots, double envelope, email, online, show of hands, etc.) for department matters in general. They may select different methods for various types of decisions unless otherwise stipulated or precluded by University policy, Collective Bargaining Agreement, and/or laws.

3.1.1 Because of the importance of deliberations in resolving conflicts and determining policies, proxy and absentee voting on departmental matters are permissible only if authorized by specific departmental guidelines/bylaws.

3.1.2 Any selected method must include a process for verifying the proportion and eligibility of those voting, and provide the option of a vote to 'abstain'.

3.2 If the Department does not have an established voting procedure at the time a decision is to be made, a vote by secret ballot conducted by the department or committee chair shall be the default practice.

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

3.4 Within departmental committees, faculty members can decide what process they will use for decision making (e.g., consensus, secret ballot).

4. Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty Departmental Voting Rights

4.1 Tenured and tenure track faculty are responsible for establishing departmental guidelines/bylaws regarding matters on which lecturers may vote.

4.2 Tenured and tenure track faculty shall have voting rights in the areas specified in sections 2.3 and 2.4, including constitution of decision-making committees for these matters, unless otherwise specified by department guidelines/bylaws, ~~voting rights for departmental curricula, curricular policies, and personnel matters, including constitution~~

~~of decision-making committees for these matters, shall be entrusted to the department's tenured and tenure track faculty.~~

4.3 Tenured and tenure-track faculty members have departmental voting rights in proportion to their permanent assignment in a department and can choose not to exercise that right (not vote).

4.4 Tenured and tenure-track faculty members with teaching assignments outside their department of permanent assignment retain full voting rights in their department of permanent assignment. In addition, they may request departmental voting rights in the non-permanent department. Proportional voting rights in the non-permanent department may be granted by a vote of ~~to their assignment in that department. The faculty member may subsequently be granted departmental voting rights following a vote of~~ the tenured and tenure track faculty in that department. ~~Faculty retain their full voting rights in their department of permanent assignment.~~

4.4.1 Departmental voting rights, when granted, take effect at the beginning of the next semester (fall or spring) and remain in effect throughout the faculty member's service in the department.

4.5 Leaves. Tenured and tenure track faculty members on an approved leave retain departmental voting rights.

4.6 Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP). Faculty participating in FERP retain departmental voting rights. They retain a full vote, regardless of their academic assignment in a given semester, through the last semester of their teaching appointment.

4.7 Tenured and tenure track faculty suspended under article 17 (Temporary Suspension) of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) retain their departmental voting rights.

4.8 Departmental voting rights of tenured and tenure track faculty are suspended for any semester in which the individual holds a full-time administrative (i.e. MPP), or other full-time non-faculty position, in the university. Faculty on re-assigned time engaged in administrative duties remain Unit 3 faculty and retain their faculty departmental voting rights.

4.9 Departmental voting rights of tenured and tenure track faculty members end upon termination of employment or full retirement.

5. Departmental Voting Rights for Lecturers

The nature of lecturers' appointments including appointment level, entitlements, and areas of expertise, among other things, affect the engagement of lecturers in

department matters. Thus, department guidelines/bylaws may prescribe lecturers' voting rights on various matters.

5.1 Lecturers can participate in votes on departmental matters excluding those entrusted to tenured and tenure track faculty by department guidelines/bylaws (per 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4 above) or university policy. ~~Lecturers can choose not to exercise their voting rights (not vote).~~

5.1.1 Lecturers have departmental voting rights in proportion to their assignment in a department and can choose not to exercise that right (not vote). ~~proportional voting rights in the department(s) in which they serve equal to the proportion of time they are teaching in the department(s), not to exceed 1.0 in any department.~~

5.1.2 Proportional voting rights of lecturers may fluctuate with fall and spring appointments.

5.2 Leaves. Lecturers on an approved partial leave retain the proportional voting rights of their teaching assignment. Those on full leave relinquish their voting rights for the duration of their leave.

5.3 Lecturers suspended under article 17 (Temporary Suspension) of the CBA retain their departmental voting rights.

5.4 Departmental voting rights of lecturers are suspended for any semester in which the individual holds a full-time administrative (i.e. MPP), or other full-time non-faculty position, in the university. Lecturers on re-assigned time engaged in administrative duties remain Unit 3 faculty and retain their faculty departmental voting rights.

5.5 Departmental voting rights of lecturers end upon termination of employment or retirement.

6. Department Chair Voting Rights.

6.1 Chairs have ~~As primary steward of a department, the permanent department chair has~~ full voting rights in the department they chair during their term regardless of the level of assignment (i.e., 0.4, 0.6).

6.2 Faculty assigned as interim or acting chair for a department outside their department of permanent assignment have full voting rights in the department they are serving in as interim or acting chair. They also retain full voting rights in their permanent department. ~~They can vote on all 'home' departmental matters.~~

7. Visiting faculty, students, staff, and other non-faculty voting rights.

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

San José State University
Academic Senate
Organization and Government Committee **AS 1629**
March 13, 2017
Final Reading

Policy Recommendation
Concurrent Membership on Operating and Policy Committees

Legislative History: Modifies bylaw 6.11 which pertains to Standing Committees (membership)

Whereas: There is a conflict of interest when a committee member concurrently serves on an operating committee and the parent policy committee, and

Whereas: Encouraging diversity in the formation of university senate committees is an essential component of shared governance, and

Whereas: Administrative representatives might concurrently serve on policy and operating committees out of necessity, therefore be it

Resolved That bylaw 6.11 be modified as follows: (addition of new 6.11 a, b, & c)

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

a) *Faculty serving on a policy committee are ineligible to serve on any operating committee reporting to that same policy committee.*
b) *The Committee on Committees chair will assure that when appointments are made they take into consideration part (a).*
c) *To the extent possible, administrative designees to operating committees and their parent policy committee should not result in concurrent membership~~. If concurrent membership is unavoidable, the administrator will serve as an exofficio non voting member on the operating committee and an exofficio voting member on the parent policy committee unless otherwise dictated by policy pertaining to committee membership.~~*

Rationale: There is a potential conflict of interest if a committee member serves on an operating committee that makes a recommendation to the parent policy committee and in essence is voting twice on the same item. The recommendation proposed would keep policy and operating committees operating independently and diminish the

possibility of crossover membership. In addition, since the new RTP standards established in the fall of 2016 include explicit expectations for service, this bylaw change would result in more service opportunities for faculty.

Approved:	2/20/17
Vote:	8-0-0
Present:	Laker, Shifflett, Higgins, Ormsbee, Boekema, Hart, Tran, Rajkovic
Absent:	Bailey, Grosvenor,
Financial Impact:	None expected
Workload Impact:	No change

San José State University
Academic Senate
Organization and Government Committee **AS 1635**
March 13, 2017
First Reading

Policy Recommendation
Amendment A to S16-8
Selection and Review of Administrators

Legislative History: Modifies S16-8 to allow for the participation of lecturers and tenure track faculty on the search and review committees for academic Deans; college-wide election of all faculty representatives; and clarifies how selection and review committee chairs are determined. ~~which pertains to the selection and review of administrators by providing flexibility in the appointment of review/selection committee members.~~

~~Whereas:~~ ~~Existing policy applies one model to the membership of all selection and review committees,~~

~~Whereas:~~ ~~Some flexibility in the constitution of committees for the selection and review of administrators could help in fitting the membership to the position under review/selection~~, 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 with regards to demographics, expertise and experience, are important, therefore, be it

Resolved That ~~section 1.3 (composition of search committees) of~~ S16-8 be modified as provided for in this policy recommendation. ~~as follows~~:

Rationale: ~~This modification will permit some flexibility in the formation of search and review committees in a way that enables the committees to be tailored to the particular position up for review or selection.~~ 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. In addition, language was provided to better enable constitution of diverse search/review committees and to reinforce the importance of confidentiality throughout the search/review process.

Approved:	3/6/17
Vote:	5-3-0
Present:	Bailey, Boekema, Grosvenor, Hart, Higgins, Ormsbee, Shifflett, Tran
Absent:	Rajkovic, Laker
Financial Impact:	None expected
Workload Impact:	No change from current situation.

Selection and Review of Administrators

1. Academic Administrator and Vice President Searches and Appointments

1.1 Applicability

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

1.2. Vacancies and Initiation of Procedures

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

1.3 Composition of Search Committees

Committees shall be large enough to allow for sufficiently broad representation, yet small enough so as not to be unwieldy. When feasible, an odd number of voting members will be appointed to eliminate the possibility of tied votes. Faculty, students, staff and administrators shall be represented. ~~Students should be represented as appropriate depending on the administrative position.~~ 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 ~~three~~ ~~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 for serving on the search committee.

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

1.3.1.2 Election Procedures

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

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

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

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

1.3.1.3 Appointment Procedures

1.3.1.3.1 Student Representative: Each department in the college shall nominate one student from its majors. The Provost shall appoint, from among those nominated, one student as a committee member.

1.3.1.3.2 Community/Administrator and Dean Representatives: The Provost shall appoint members who have experience or expertise relevant to one or more of the programs in the college and/or the position of Dean.

1.3.1.3.3 Faculty/Staff Representatives: Following the conclusion of college elections for faculty and staff representatives, the Provost shall appoint those elected to the search committee.

1.3.1.3.3.1 Following elections and prior to finalizing appointments, the Provost shall review the committee membership and consider the extent to which it is a representative group. The review may include, though is not limited to, representation of the programs in the college and the composition of the pool with regard to gender and ethnicity.

If the membership appears insufficiently representative, the Provost shall consult with the Senate's Executive Committee to determine

how best to improve the representativeness of the search committee. This could include the appointment of up to two additional members while maintaining the requirement that a majority of members be faculty.

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

1.3.2.1 Recruitment Procedures

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

1.3.2.2 Election Procedures for Library Faculty and Staff

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

Elections for the faculty and staff representatives from the Library shall be arranged and conducted by staff in the Dean's office who are not on the ballot.

1.3.2.3 Appointment Procedures

Student, Faculty (outside library) and Department Chair Representative: By mutual consent with the Senate Executive Committee, the Provost shall appoint members from among those who applied.

Community and Dean Representatives: The Provost shall appoint members who have experience or expertise relevant to our joint library and/or the position of Dean and who understand our commitment to diversity and inclusion.

Library Faculty/Staff Representative: Following the conclusion of library elections for faculty and staff representatives, the Provost shall appoint those elected to the search committee.

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

1.3.3.1 Recruitment Procedures

Recruitment of the faculty, student, and staff members shall be arranged and conducted by the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate through normal committee on committees processes. Interested faculty, students and staff will submit written statements reflecting their interest and qualifications. ~~Selected members should exhibit clear evidence of understanding IES and a history of engagement with the programs and activities of IES.~~

1.3.3.2 Election Procedures for IES Staff Member

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

Elections for the staff representatives from IES shall be arranged and conducted by Dean's office staff who are not on the ballot.

1.3.3.3 Appointment Procedures

Selected members should exhibit clear evidence of understanding IES, a history of engagement with the programs and activities of IES, and an understanding of our commitment to diversity and inclusion.

Student and Faculty Representatives: By mutual consent with the Senate Executive Committee, the Provost shall appoint members from among those who applied.

Dean Representative: The Provost shall appoint this representative.

IES Staff Representatives: Following the conclusion of elections for staff representatives, the Provost shall appoint those elected to the search committee.

1.4 Recruitment and Selection of Committee Members

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

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

mutually satisfactory course of action. Failing that, the President or Provost shall appoint the membership. The President or Provost shall select the committee chair from the committee membership.

1.5. Scope and Procedures

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

1.6. Committee Recommendations

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

1.7. Action by the President

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

1.8. Interim Appointments

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

Alternatively, at the discretion of the President or Provost, the selection process for an interim appointee may utilize a selection committee wherein the interim position is announced campus-wide and interviews are held. While there is no requirement to

announce the position off-campus, such announcement is not prohibited. The search committee must be no smaller than three people and will be selected by the President or Provost in consultation with the elected members of the Senate Executive Committee. Interim appointments usually are for a period of one year, unless a different period is specified at the time of the appointment. An interim appointment may be renewed or extended by the President or Provost as needed in consultation with the elected members of the Senate Executive Committee.

1.9. Acting Appointments

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

2. Reviews of Administrators

2.1. Timing of Review

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

2.2. Appointment and Composition of Review Committee

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

2.3 Criteria for Review

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

2.4 Procedures for Review

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

2.5. Report of the Review Committee

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

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

2.5.3 Before forwarding the report, the review committee shall:

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

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

2.6. Action of the President

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

San Jose State University
Academic Senate
Instruction & Student Affairs Committee **AS 1637**
March 13, 2017
Final Reading

Policy Recommendation
Required Enrollment for Culminating Graduate Students

Legislative history: Replaces F11-2

Whereas Graduate students usually receive a Report-in-Progress (RP) grade on thesis, project, or comprehensive exam courses while they are in the process of completing their research, scholarly or creative activity, report, and/or comprehensive exams; and

Whereas Graduate culminating experiences can involve considerable university resources, including faculty and staff time and library resources; and

Whereas Payment of fees for these services sets a standard to the student, faculty, and university that the professional nature of the relationship must be respected and that all parties involved must provide their needed and timely input in the process; and

Whereas At SJSU, there is a two-tiered payment structure (0-6 units or greater than 6 units) in regular session courses. Fees solely for 1 unit can be charged only through special sessions; and

Whereas Most universities require enrollment (with fees) of graduate students as they work on their culminating experiences, including at least nine other CSU campuses; and

Whereas This policy recommendation has the unanimous support of the University Graduate Studies & Research Committee;

Whereas The current system of ensuring continuous enrollment for SJSU graduate students who have completed all of their requirements for a master's degree except for the culminating experience is to allow them to take a 1-unit UNVS or Departmental 1290R course, which limits the fees collected from students to a small amount; therefore be it

Resolved That F11-2 be rescinded and replaced with the following policy.

Approved:	March 6, 2017
Vote:	13-0-0
Present:	Bruck (non-voting), Campsey, Kaufman, Khan, Nash, Ng (non-voting), Saran, Sen, Simpson, Spica, Torres, Trousdale, Walters, Wilson, Yao
Financial Impact:	Addition of funds to the university through added fee collection, financial cost to students
Workload Impact:	Additional workload to Graduate Admissions & Program Evaluations to review registration of students in RP status prior to processing "Verification of Culminating Experience;" additional registrar workload to transfer students to special session status; additional Graduate Studies workload to administer the program, review appeals, handle retroactive adds, and alleviate problems with the system.

Required Enrollment for Culminating Graduate Students

1. All master's candidates on a thesis (Plan A) or creative project (Plan C) track must receive credit for at least one unit of a Departmental 299 course as a degree requirement to receive a master's degree. The total number of units for which master's degree credit may be received is governed by the limitation that not more than six semester units shall be allowed for a thesis or project, as stipulated in the California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Article 7, Section 40510. This limitation extends to all project or thesis-preparation (but not thesis writing) courses (often 298s although other course numbers are also used) but not to research classes. There is no limitation on the number of 298, 299, or other project or thesis course units that can be taken so long as credit (CR grade) is not received in project or thesis courses until all degree requirements are met and the units in excess of six do not appear on the degree candidacy form. The 299 and 599 numbers may be used for no purpose other than a thesis or dissertation, respectively. Despite the parlance used in some departments in calling non-299 reports "theses," a thesis is defined as a document written and submitted according to the SJSU Master's Thesis and Doctoral Dissertation Guidelines and formally reviewed by Graduate Studies within the Office of Graduate & Undergraduate Programs (GUP). Unless a thesis or dissertation is approved by Graduate Studies, thesis (299) and dissertation (599) units may not be awarded credit (CR grade). Credit in Plan B project (usually 298s) and comprehensive exam-preparation courses must also be delayed until the completion of the project or passage of the exam, respectively. Students switching from Plan A thesis to Plan B project or comprehensive exam must retroactively drop any 299 thesis units on their record or have the grades changed to NC. Project units must then be taken or added, but the latter only if all requirements of the project class, including submission of a final project report, have been fulfilled while pursuing the thesis. No more than 12 units of dissertation writing credit (599) can be applied to the doctoral degree.

2. Effective Fall 2012, once a culminating experience supervisory course (thesis, dissertation, project, or comprehensive exam-preparation course required in the degree program) has been taken with any non-letter grade (RP, I, CR), graduate students will be required to enroll in regular session (state-supported) classes to finish the requirements of their degree program or a special session (self-supported) class, UNVS or Departmental 1290R every fall and spring semester until the culminating experience is completed. Thus continuous enrollment is required of graduate students once they have begun their culminating experience work and have completed all other course requirements for their degrees. For programs that split the culminating experience coursework into two or more semesters, the requirement of continuous enrollment applies to that period following the second of those semesters unless other degree-required coursework is still to be taken. Instructors must not give grades of CR until the students have completed the course requirements; however, if they mistakenly are given CR grades, this policy still

requires the students to maintain continuous enrollment, thus allowing the students to take 1290R. The instructor of the class will be asked to change the grade to an RP. If any work for a class is handed in after the last day of the semester, the student must enroll the following semester even if the work simply completes an incomplete or RP. Students receiving C- or lower letter grades or NC grades in their culminating courses must repeat those courses and are therefore not eligible for the 1290R course. Summers are excluded from this continuous enrollment requirement. As previously, departments can require retaking 298, 299, 599, or other project or exam-preparation courses if it is deemed that the student needs repetition of the instruction given in those courses. The exception to this requirement for course enrollment each semester until graduation is for students with an official leave of absence from the university. However, as per University Policy S15-3, VIII, 2, graduate students at this point in their program will not be eligible for a leave of absence other than a medical or military leave, except under rare circumstances. Continuous enrollment will be substantiated by GAPE prior to processing of the "Verification of Culminating Experience" memo indicating degree completion.

3. The 1290R-courses are to be made available as an accommodation to graduate students to maintain continuous enrollment in fall and spring semesters at a reduced cost in comparison with regular session enrollment. Students may elect to retake the regular session thesis, dissertation, project, or exam-preparation course in which the original RP or I grade was obtained instead of taking the special session 1290R course; therefore, the 1290R course is not an absolute degree requirement.

4. The Provost, in consultation with the the Academic Planning & Budget unit, will set the special session fees for the UNVS and Departmental 1290R courses. The UNVS 1290R course has been created by GUP and is available in the semester immediately following approval of this policy. If a program does not already have a 1290R course, the program must propose it. For those departments/schools that fail to create the classes, their students will take the UNVS 1290R course. For the UNVS 1290R course, the Provost will determine the distribution of the fees collected but will not include distribution to the colleges and departments/schools with which the students are affiliated. Retroactive course add fees will apply for students who enroll in the 1290R course after the end of the semester.

5. Students who register in courses in which RP is a grading option will be notified, by the Registrar in collaboration with GUP, of this policy and the fee ramifications if an RP grade is earned. All reading committees and project, thesis, dissertation, and comprehensive exam-preparation advisors in classes in which RP is a grading option will be notified by GUP of the fee ramifications and timeline applicable if an RP grade is awarded. Students who earn an RP grade will be notified by the Registrar on how to enroll in the special sessions course.

6. The university requires continuous enrollment of graduate students once all degree requirements are satisfied other than the culminating experience; thus "stopping out" for even a single semester is not permitted at this point in the graduate career. This latter requirement applies to all graduate students, even if the culminating experience is a set of comprehensive exams for which there is no departmental preparation

class. Therefore, all graduate students, no matter the culminating experience and courses associated with it, must be enrolled each semester once all degree requirements other than the culminating experience are fulfilled. Those who fail to register for the designated course will be notified by GAPE that they must retroactively add the course in each semester missed. If such students have not at that point finished their culminating experience, they must enroll each semester thereafter until it is completed. If they have completed all degree requirements, they can graduate. In either of these cases, the students need not apply for re-admission.

7. Appeals of the 1290R course fee on the basis that the delay in completing the culminating experience was substantially beyond the student's control can be made to the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies. Results of the appeal will be communicated to the student within four weeks of the student filing the appeal.

San José State University
Academic Senate **AS 1641**
Curriculum and Research Committee
March 13, 2017
Final Reading

Policy Recommendation: Amendment A to University Policy S16-14: Clarification of 'Internship'

Legislative History: Amends S16-14

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

Resolved: That the following amendments be adopted immediately.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Resolved: That if an internship is an elective for a degree program, it should be clear (i.e., through catalog description, advising, and other program materials) to the student that he/she will make their own placement and no UOA will be required; be it further

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

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

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

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

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

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

Resolved: That all learning sites be entered into the CSU database in a timely

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

Resolved: That the department is responsible for the renewal of its UOA(s) and the oversight of the renewal process of UOAs rests with the Office of Student and Faculty Success; if a site requests modifications to an existing UOA, consultation with and approval from Administration and Finance (Contracts and Purchasing, Risk Management) will be needed.

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

Approved (C&R): March 6, 2017
Vote: 12-0-0
Present: Anagnos, Buzanski, Chang, Cargill, Chung, Grindstaff, Medrano, Mathur, Matoush, Rodan, Trulio, Stacks
Absent: Heil

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

Financial Impact: Very closely tied to the Workload Impact. Staff resources are needed to process and review UOAs, train and support users, and maintain the CSU database(s),

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

Workload impact will be closely tied to the following factors:
- the number of students enrolled in a given department's internship program
- the total number of organizations at which the department's students are interning

- the percentage of the organizations with which a department is working already has a non-expired UOA on file
-the complexity of the UOA approval process.

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

San José State University
Academic Senate
Organization and Government Committee **AS 1642**
March 13, 2017
Final Reading

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Approved:	2/20/17
Vote:	9-0-1
Present:	Grosvenor, Laker, Shifflett, Rajkovic, Ormsbee, Boekema, Hart, Tran, Higgins, Bailey
Absent:	None
Financial Impact:	None expected
Workload Impact:	Increased workload for the originating members as they establish connections and determine how best to meet the elements of their charge and effectively impact efforts campus-wide around student success.

Charge:

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

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

Membership:

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

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

Recruitment and Appointment of Members

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

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

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
Academic Senate
Professional Standards Committee
March 13, 2017 **AS 1643**
Final Reading

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

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

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

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

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

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

> At SJSU, probationary faculty may apply for early tenure under the terms explained in University Policy S15-8, which is attached. The policy specifies much higher standards for early tenure than are required for tenure after a full six year period. However, in light of your prior tenure at a

> comparable university, SJSU offers to evaluate your application for tenure after five years of probation (with your service credit counting towards that time) using the normal standards for tenure. While a favorable decision will still depend upon your ability to meet our standards, this offer will give you an option that you may find helpful if you seek to reduce your time to tenure

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

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

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

Approved: Under Review by the Committee

Vote: 8-0-0

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

Absent: White, Kauppila

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

Workload Impact: No direct impacts.

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

……..

5.0 Appointment letters

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

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

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

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

5.5 <u>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</u>

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.

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
Academic Senate
Professional Standards Committee
March 13, 2016 **AS 1646**
First Reading

Policy Recommendation
Selection and Review of Department Chairs and Directors

Resolved: That S14-8 be rescinded and replaced with the following policy, effective immediately for all new nominations and reviews.

Rationale: *This revision of S14-8 incorporates the voting procedures for nominating Department Chairs and Directors that were formerly only available in a separate policy. The need to consult two separate policies each time a department nominates a Chair has led to confusion and procedural errors in the past. In addition, the policy has be reformatted for easier use and a number of corrections have been incorporated at the suggestion of the University Counil of Chairs and Directors and the Deans. Among those changes is a reordering of the policy to align chronologically with the stages of a Chair's nomination, election, evaluation, and possible removal.*

Approved: March 6, 2017

Vote: 9-0-0

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

Absent: Reade

Financial Impact: No direct impacts. It is possible that this policy, by clarifying process, could result in some savings.

Workload Impact: No direct impacts, although the clarification of methods for selection and review of department chairs could potentially prevent some time consuming failures of process.

Policy Recommendation
Selection and Review of Department Chairs and Directors

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Preamble

Department Chairs are the leaders of communities of faculty as well as the most important stewards of the mission of the University at the local level. Their effectiveness depends upon the continual support of the faculty they represent. The selection of a Department Chair is therefore the most important collective decision of department faculty. This policy is designed to assure that Chairs are chosen and reviewed in a manner that assures their continual legitimacy and effectiveness as they carry out the numerous functions assigned to them by university policies and the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

1.2. Definitions.

1.2.1. Throughout this policy, the term "Chair" refers both to Chairs of Departments and Directors of Schools, while the term "Department" refers both to Departments and to Schools.

1.2.2. Departments elect a "nominee" to be department Chair; the President appoints a nominee to become Chair. Hence department elections are a nomination process with the outcome of choosing a "Chair nominee" and are called "nomination elections."

1.2.3. The terms "Professor" and "Associate Professor" are also understood to include the equivalent titles in faculty disciplines that use alternative names, such as librarians and counselors.

1.2.4. This policy uses the generic term "chair" to refer collectively to all categories of chairs regardless of the manner of nomination and appointment. When there is a need for greater differentiation, the policy will refer to "acting chair" and "interim chair" as defined later in the policy, and "regularly appointed chair" to refer to a chair who has been nominated by the department and appointed by the President for the standard four year term.

2. QUALIFICATIONS

Chairs should preferably be Professors but may be Associates, and should have earned rank and tenure prior to the time the appointment to Chair would become effective. Exceptions should only be made in rare instances and for compelling reasons approved by the President in consultation with the Professional Standards committee. ~~Chair nominee requirements: The nominees for chair must be tenured faculty holding positions of Associate or Full Professor or equivalent at the time the appointment to Chair would become effective.~~

3. DEPARTMENT NOMINATING PROCESS

Every four years, the department faculty shall identify a nominee ~~one or more nominees~~ for Department Chair by secret ballot vote following these procedures ~~outlined in F02-4.~~ These are also the ~~preferred~~ procedures, ~~when time permits,~~ for departments to recommend candidates for an acting role as Chair (in section 10 below.)

3.1. Charging the Department: The Dean (or designee) should attend a Department meeting at the beginning of the nomination process to provide this policy~~, the department voting rights policy,~~ and the Chair's job description and fraction of assigned time, and to explain the process for nominating a Chair. The job description should be developed in consultation with the Department and should be periodically reviewed. The Dean (or designee) should depart before deliberations begin, unless specifically invited to remain by the majority vote of the faculty present.

3.2. Open meeting. A meeting shall be held to begin the election of a nominee to serve as Department Chair. The department may determine the nature and medium of the meeting according to its own preferences, but the meeting must be open to all faculty in the department and publicized a minimum of one week in advance.

3.3. Decision on external search. The department may decide at this stage, through normal voting procedures, to seek permission to search for an external chair (as per section 4.1 below) instead of proceeding immediately with a normal nominating election. Should permission be denied the department should proceed to 3.4.

3.4. At the open meeting, faculty may suggest names to appear on the ballot for the nominating election. The meeting shall provide the opportunity to ascertain the willingness of candidates to serve, for candidates to make statements, and for candidates to take questions.

3.5. The nominating election. All faculty may then vote by secret ballot (proportional votes for part-time faculty) on all candidates proposed and willing to serve. Balloting must be available for 5 working days.

3.5.1. If there is just one candidate, balloting must still occur, with a choice provided to "recommend" or "do not recommend" the candidate.

3.5.2. If there are two candidates, balloting will provide a choice between the two candidates and a choice "do not recommend any candidate."

3.5.3. If there are three or more candidates, the ballot may use ranked-order preferential voting, as per Robert's Rules Revised, with one preference being "do not recommend any candidate."

3.6. Counting the votes. The votes will be counted by a college election committee that will consist of three individuals including one ~~a minimum of one or more~~ member of the College RTP committee (chosen by the committee from a department other than the one holding the nomination election) plus one representative from the Dean's office (chosen by the Dean), and one tenured faculty member from the department (chosen by the department personnel committee from among those department faculty who are not candidates.) In addition, one faculty observer (other than any candidate) appointed by each candidate shall be allowed to observe the vote count upon request. ~~. representative from the Department~~. ~~To promote~~

~~transparency, and to the extent possible while preserving the principle of secret ballots, the elections committee will allow the counting of the ballots to be observed by any interested parties.~~ The results shall be tallied and certified (signed) by the election committee.

3.7. Forwarding the name. Only the name of a candidate who receives a majority of votes cast by the regular (tenured and probationary) faculty shall be forwarded to the President via the College Dean as the nominee of the department.

3.8. Distributing the results. A statement of the vote of all faculty, broken down into two categories – vote by regular faculty and by temporary faculty-- including the actual number of votes cast in each category – will be forwarded to the President via the College Dean. If the final vote total from part-time faculty contains a fraction, it shall be rounded to help preserve anonymity. The results shall also distributed to the faculty from the relevant department.

~~The department voting rights for the selection and review of Department Chair are included in the Department Voting Rights policy, (F02-4 as of May, 2014, or its successor policy).~~

3.9. Second round nomination elections. If a department is unable to nominate a Chair by a majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty, it may continue to try to obtain a nominee by repeating the process if they are willing and the Dean determines that there is sufficient time. Otherwise the situation will be resolved via section 6 "Failure to Obtain…"

4. EXTERNAL SEARCHES

4.1. Request for an external search. An external search is a search in which candidates from outside San Jose State University are invited to apply to be hired as a tenured faculty member and as department Chair. Department faculty may request an external search for department chair with the understanding that a successful search might have a negative impact on funding available for other recruitment. At the option of the department, an external search could also allow internal candidates to apply and be granted equal consideration. A department request for an external search should take the form of a majority vote of the department (following normal procedures for department voting rights). Such requests are not automatically granted.

4.2. Procedures for an external search. Successful completion of an external search for a department Chair requires coordination of two separate tasks: the appointment of a new faculty member in accordance with the appointment policy and the recommendation to the President of a Chair nominee in accordance with this policy. To expedite the successful conclusion of such a search, departments may combine some procedures that are common to both processes as outlined below. Departments should determine which of these three alternatives they will use by majority vote (following the normal procedures for department voting rights), and they must do so prior to the start of a search. Whichever method the department adopts, the recruitment committee must conform to the normal requirements of the appointment section of the Appointment, Retention, Tenure and Promotion policy.

4.2.1. Departments may designate all permanent and probationary faculty as a recruitment committee "of the whole" so that the appointment recommendation and the nomination recommendation are

coterminous. When this method is chosen, the committee of the whole must provide temporary faculty with the opportunity to provide confidential feedback on the search prior to final recommendations. A department may only use this method when a majority of its permanent faculty are tenured. If it chooses this method, the normal prohibition of faculty serving on a personnel committee evaluating faculty of higher rank is suspended.

4.2.2. Departments may use separate processes for the appointment and for the nomination functions associated with an external search for a department Chair. Using this method, a smaller recruitment committee makes a recommendation under the normal appointment policy. Then the department as a whole votes to endorse or not to endorse the recommendation of the recruitment committee. For each candidate, the department's endorsement must specify whether or not that candidate is acceptable as a Chair. If more than one candidate is acceptable, the department must rank them in order of preference. The department's endorsement serves to nominate a candidate to be Chair, but should be accompanied by the recruitment committee's report to justify the appointment. In the event of conflict between the recommendations of the recruitment committee and the department, the department makes the final recommendation as to who to nominate as its Chair, but may only nominate from among those candidates deemed to be acceptable finalists by the recruitment committee. When this method is chosen by a department, time must be budgeted to allow these procedures to take place at the conclusion of the search.

4.2.3. Departments may choose to delegate their prerogative to nominate a Chair exclusively to their recruitment committee.

4.3. In conformity with the ARTP (Appointment, Retention, Tenure, and Promotion) policy, an external nominee for Chair shall be reviewed and must receive a favorable recommendation for tenure from the appropriate personnel committee of the department before the appointment can be completed.

5. APPOINTMENT

5.1. The President appoints and removes the Department Chair in consultation with the Provost, College Dean, and department faculty. The term of the appointment is normally four years.

5.2. Except in rare instances and for compelling reasons, the President shall appoint a person recommended by the department faculty.

5.3. Technical details concerning the appointment of a Chair (appointment letters, salary adjustments, etc.) will be coordinated by the Office of the Provost.

6. FAILURE TO OBTAIN CHAIR NOMINEES AS DESCRIBED IN SECTIONS 3 (Nominations), 8 (Reappointment), and 10 (Acting)

Departments may be unable to successfully conclude a normal nomination for Department Chair. This could be the case in a department with no senior ~~(associate or full professor)~~ leadership qualified to be Chair, or no willing candidates. If a department fails to reach consensus (majority vote of the tenured and probationary faculty) following a normal nomination process (Section III), the Dean shall consult with the faculty at a department meeting to determine the best

course of action. This could be either the nomination of an interim or acting Chair, initiation of an external search, extension of a prior interim appointment, or nomination of a non-departmental interim Chair-- as per the relevant sections of this policy.

6.1. External Search. An external search may be requested as per section 4 of the policy, although such requests are not automatically granted.

6.2. Extended interim Chairs. If there has been a failure to reach consensus, and an interim Chair is serving and was not a candidate for Chair, the interim Chair may be extended by six months to allow time for more permanent solutions. Normally, a department should not have to operate under interim leadership for more than one year.

6.3. Non departmental interim Chairs. In extreme cases, and only when all of the aforementioned measures fail, the President may appoint a SJSU faculty member from outside the department to serve as interim Chair, after consultation with the College Dean and department faculty. External departmental interim Chairs are subject to all the normal limits provided in section 9. Consultation with the department faculty is normally done by the Provost and Dean soliciting advice at a department meeting.

6.4. Extended interim Chairs. The extension of an interim appointment beyond one year represents a failure of collegiality and should be avoided. If this occurs the Organization and Government Committee of the Academic Senate shall inquire into the reasons for the situation and report its recommendations to the Senate and the President.

7. REVIEW OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

7.1. Timing of Normal Review: The Dean shall initiate the formal review of each Department Chair during the fourth year of an incumbent's term, unless the incumbent states that he/she will not be a candidate to ~~If the incumbent wishes to~~ continue as Chair ~~in his or her position~~ beyond the fourth year~~., a review of the incumbent shall be initiated according to the provisions of this policy in the fourth year of an incumbent's term.~~

7.2. Early Review: At any time, department faculty may initiate ~~request~~ a formal review of the Department Chair by submitting a petition to the Dean ~~a petition.~~ The petition shall state simply that "The undersigned faculty call for a prompt review of our Department Chair." If the petition is signed by department faculty totaling more than 50% of the department electorate, ~~signed 50% of the department electorate as defined by F02-4. Except in rare instances and for compelling reasons, after this request from the department faculty,~~ the College Dean will initiate the formal review of the Department Chair. To determine if the petition exceeds the 50% threshold, the signatures of both permanent and temporary faculty will be counted, with the signatures of temporary faculty weighted according to the proportion of their appointment. The Dean will announce the number of signatures and whether the petition exceeds the threshold, but will keep the petition itself and the signed names confidential.

7.3. Appointment and Composition of Review Committee: At the beginning of the fourth year of the Department Chair's term, under the direction of the College Dean, the tenured and tenure-track department faculty shall elect from its ranks a peer review committee to evaluate the Department Chair's performance[1]. The review committee, in consultation with the College Dean, will determine the procedures and scope of the review.

[1] See CFA/CSU Agreement Article 15

7.4. Criteria for Review: The review committee, in consultation with the College Dean, shall specify the criteria for evaluating the incumbent's job performance. The principal criteria shall be derived from the job description that was provided to the Chair at the time of appointment. The incumbent shall be asked to examine the criteria developed and to make such comments or suggestions as may seem advisable.

7.5. Procedures for Review: The review committee, in consultation with the College Dean, shall develop procedures for conducting the review. The procedures shall be designed to secure appropriate information and appraisals of performance from as many persons as may be feasible who are knowledgeable of the incumbent's performance. If he/she so desires, the incumbent shall be given an opportunity to provide the review committee with a self-evaluation based upon the criteria developed by the committee. The opinions and judgments received by review committees, the deliberations and reports of such committees, and any accompanying materials, shall be confidential.

7.6. Report of the Review Committee: At the conclusion of its evaluative activities, the review committee shall prepare a written report embodying findings and conclusions. The report of the review committee shall include a statement of strengths found and improvements desired in the incumbent's performance with respect to the evaluative criteria. All raw data collected for review shall accompany, but not be part of, the review committee's summary narrative. Before forwarding the final report to the College Dean, the review committee shall:

7.6.1. Provide a draft copy of the narrative portion of the report to the incumbent;

7.6.2. Provide the incumbent with an opportunity to meet with the review committee in order to discuss the report;

7.6.3. Provide the incumbent with the opportunity to submit to the committee a written statement which shall become part of the report to the College Dean.

The review committee shall forward its final report to the College Dean. The College Dean will discuss the findings with the Department Chair and will report in general to the department faculty. On completion, the final report from the review committee, additional evaluation by the College Dean, and any response from the Department Chair will be forwarded to the Provost.

7.7. Confidentiality. The review committee, college dean, and officers of the University shall hold in confidence data received by the review committee, its report, and accompanying materials.

8. REAPPOINTMENT OF A DEPARTMENT CHAIR

In order to serve one or more subsequent terms, the Department Chair must proceed through the review process and regular nominating process.

9. SELECTION OF AN INTERIM CHAIR

An interim appointment occurs when a Department Chair’s position has or will be vacated and there is insufficient time or it is otherwise impractical to complete the regular nomination process explained in Section I (Nominations).

The interim Chair serves only as long as required to complete the appointment of a permanent chair.

9.1. Appointment procedure. The President may make interim appointments after consultation with the College Dean and department faculty, normally by soliciting advice from as many faculty as possible at a department meeting called for this purpose.

9.2. Interim Chair requirements. Interim appointments should normally be a member of the department in which they will serve and they should be tenured faculty members (see section 6 for exceptions.)

9.3. Transition to a regularly appointed Chair. While overseeing all the complex tasks of the department, the interim Chair's ultimate responsibility is to prepare the department for an orderly transition to a regularly appointed Chair. ~~The department, under the leadership of the interim Chair, should initiate the normal process for the nomination of a department Chair.~~ The interim Chair should serve until a regularly appointed Chair takes office, normally by the end of the ~~current semester, but not more than six months~~ first full semester following the appointment, with summer service being a matter of mutual agreement between the interim Chair and the President. For example, an interim Chair appointed in April could serve through the end of Fall semester, or an October appointee could serve to the end of Spring semester or (by mutual consent) through the summer. If the department cannot transition to a regularly appointed Chair within ~~six months~~ this time frame, the situation should be resolved under section 6 (Failure to Obtain) of this policy.

9.4. Technical details concerning the appointment of an interim Chair (appointment letter, salary adjustments, etc.) will be coordinated by the Office of the Provost.

10. SELECTION OF AN ACTING CHAIR

An acting appointment occurs when a Department Chair is on a temporary absence (illness, vacation, or leave) but is expected to return within a year. If the absence is less than one month, the Dean, in consultation (if possible) with the continuing Chair may determine that there is no need for an acting Chair. Otherwise, an acting Chair is appointed and serves only until the permanent Chair returns.

10.1. Planned need for acting Chair. When the short-term absence of a Chair can be anticipated, the Department should nominate an Acting Chair using the procedures outlined in III (normal nomination.)

10.2. Sudden need for acting Chair. When there is insufficient time or it is otherwise impractical to complete the regular nomination process explained in Section III, an Acting Chair should be designated using the procedures outlined in IV (interim.)

10.3. Limit on length of service. An Acting Chair should not serve more than one full academic year, and possibly the summer before or after the academic year. A Chair who is absent for more than one year should be replaced.

10.4. Technical details concerning the appointment of an acting Chair (appointment letter, salary adjustments, etc.) will be coordinated by the Office of the Provost.

11. REMOVAL OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR

In rare circumstances it may become necessary to remove a Department Chair prior to the expiration of the four year term. There are two possible situations in which a Chair may be removed.

11.1. Administrative removal. The administrative removal of a Chair previously recommended by the faculty of a department is a very serious matter, and should only be undertaken for compelling reasons, such as criminal activity, manifest breach of ethics, gross malfeasance of duties, or other extremely serious personnel matters. A Chair shall receive due process appropriate to the nature of the offense that justifies removal. Prior to removal, the President or Provost should meet with the Dean and the faculty assembled in a department meeting to announce ~~explain~~ the action and solicit advice on the transition. If it is impossible to meet prior to the removal, then the meeting should be held as soon as a majority of the faculty can be assembled. Replacement of the Chair should be initiated according to the procedures in sections I or IV of this policy.

11.2. Faculty initiated removal. Faculty may not initiate the removal of their Chair unless a formal review has been completed within the previous six months. (They may initiate such a review as per II.1 of this policy.) Following the conclusion of any faculty-initiated early review, the department will vote to determine if their Chair should be recalled. ~~The recall vote will follow normal procedures for department voting rights.~~ A recall vote will follow the same procedures as a vote to recommend a Chair nominee as described in section III of this policy, save only that it requires a vote of 2/3 of the probationary and permanent faculty to forward a recommendation to the President that the Chair be removed, with the votes of temporary faculty also reported as per the above procedures. If removed, replacement of the Chair should be initiated according to the procedures in sections III or IV of this policy.

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
Academic Senate
Professional Standards Committee
March 13, 2017 **AS 1647**
First Reading

Policy Recommendation
Rescinding and Replacing F97-7 Policy on Privacy of Electronic Information

Resolved: That F97-7 be rescinded.

Resolved: That the following be adopted as policy effective immediately.

Rationale: This document summarizes important principles on privacy of electronic information found in the AAUP document "Academic Freedom and Electronic Communications" and elements copied from the University of California system policy on "Electronic Communications." Our archaic F97-7 was very vague and increasingly obsolete. The CSU system policy has some useful protections, but does not directly address information privacy in a forthright manner. This document explains the rationale for protecting protects privacy of electronic information within the context of academic freedom and the culture of a university of higher learning.

While Professional Standards originally created a bulkier and considerably more specific policy draft, negotiations with the President's Chief of Staff and the Information Security Officer persuaded us to slim the policy down to key principles and leave the minutiae to a Presidential Directive that is currently under draft.

Approved: *March 6, 2017*

Vote: *7-0-0*

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

Absent: *White, Reade, Lee*

Financial Impact: *No direct impacts*

Workload Impact: *No direct impacts*

Policy Recommendation
Principles Regarding Privacy of Electronic Information

1. Purpose

   1.1. San José State University (SJSU) recognizes that principles of academic freedom and shared governance, freedom of speech, and privacy hold important implications for the use of electronic communications.
   1.2. SJSU respects the privacy of electronic communications in the same way that it respects the privacy of paper correspondence and telephone conversations, while seeking to ensure that University administrative records are accessible for the conduct of the University's business.
   1.3. SJSU recognizes the value of privacy as a condition for academic freedom and the benefits that privacy and autonomy bring to the individual, to groups, and to the culture of SJSU.
   1.4. SJSU recognizes that faculty members and students have a reasonable expectation of privacy in their electronic communications.

2. Principles governing involuntary disclosure

   2.1. ***Rarely used and clearly defined***. SJSU does not examine or disclose the contents of electronic records without the consent of the individual participating in the communication except in rare cases that are clearly defined.
   2.2. ***Clear authorization.*** When involuntary disclosure takes place, it must first be authorized by the President, and records of the authorization must be kept.
   2.3. ***Least Perusal.*** Authorization shall be limited to the least perusal of contents and the least action necessary to resolve a matter.
   2.4. ***Disclosure.*** SJSU shall at the earliest opportunity that is lawful and consistent with other University policy notify the affected individual of the action(s) taken and the reasons for the action(s) taken.
   2.5. ***Institutional Accountability.*** In a manner consistent with law and concerns of confidentiality, SJSU shall prepare an annual report tracking the frequency and general purpose of all authorizations of involuntary disclosure. This report will be circulated to an appropriate body of stakeholders that will include tenured faculty chosen by the Academic Senate.

3. Implementation

   The President will issue and maintain a directive that implements the purpose and principles of this policy

4. Privacy Advisory

   Various laws and available security technologies affect the degree of privacy that users can expect. No electronic system is entirely secure from unauthorized intrusions. Users should be warned that legal requirements may require disclosure, such as disclosure under the Public Records Act, discovery in civil

litigation, and legal searches performed in cooperation with state and federal law enforcement authorities.

San Jose State University
Academic Senate
Instruction & Student Affairs Committee **AS 1648**
March 13, 2017
First Reading

Policy Recommendation
Graduate Student Revalidation of Courses that Exceed the 7-Year Limit

Whereas: SJSU does not have policy on expiration or revalidation of graduate coursework; and

Whereas: the University Graduate Studies & Research Committee endorsed this policy unanimously; therefore be it

Resolved: That the following policy be enacted.

Approved:	March 6, 2017
Vote:	13-0-0
Present:	Bruck (non-voting), Campsey, Kaufman, Khan, Nash, Ng (non-voting), Saran, Sen, Simpson, Spica, Torres, Trousdale, Walters, Wilson, Yao
Financial Impact:	None
Workload impact:	Slight increase for faculty supervising the revalidation process, though this is already university practice.

Graduate Student Revalidation of Courses that Exceed the 7-Year Limit

1. Courses taken by graduate students at SJSU expire 7 years from the point of grade posting, in compliance with California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Article 7, Section 40510. A maximum of 9 units for a 30-unit program (or 12 units for a program with more than 30 units) of expired courses may be revalidated by any one student. Programs have the option of setting stricter policy limits on revalidation, such as allowing no units or fewer units to be revalidated. The student must have earned at least a "B" grade in a course to revalidate it. The department that offered the class must administer an exam for each course that will be revalidated. The exam can be either an oral or written one, and it must be designed and graded by the faculty member who taught the original course, by one who has taught the course at another time, or by one who has reasonable knowledge of the course content. If there are no faculty members with the requisite knowledge in the discipline, the course cannot be revalidated. The exam must be a rigorous one, invariably requiring studying on the part of the student. It must not necessarily though require recollection of all of the material in the original class; thus, administering an exam similar to the original final exam would not be warranted.

2. Because the course material is considered outdated after 7 years, the goal must be to determine if the student's knowledge is up to date. That is, simply knowing the original content of an outdated course is inadequate. Students may be presented with a list of relevant books or other materials that would help bring them up to speed with respect to current knowledge in the field. The exam should reflect and test their understanding of that more current material. Testing the current knowledge of the field should be the goal even if the course has changed little or the field has not progressed past the point of the original class.

3. Supervisory courses, such as independent study, seminar, research, project, thesis, or comprehensive exam preparatory courses, cannot be revalidated. Graduate courses taken as a senior undergraduate at SJSU to be used for graduate credit are eligible for revalidation (with departmental consent), but those taken at other institutions are not. If these courses expire, they must be repeated or replaced. Expiration of projects and theses is an extremely rare event given that they usually occur at the end of the curricular program. If they were to expire, they would have to be replaced by entirely new ones that did not repeat any material in the original one. Theses previously published would remain in the SJSU repository as legitimate contributions. Comprehensive exams would need to be retaken in their entirety to reflect the more current state of material in the field. Credential courses can be revalidated at the discretion of the department.

4. If students can present a compelling case that their progress through the program was delayed unnecessarily by inattentive department advisors, unavailability of required courses, or other departmental circumstances beyond their control, they can appeal to the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies for an extension of the limit. Extensions should very rarely be awarded.

5. Approval of the revalidation will be by the examining professor, the program's graduate advisor, and the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies.