

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE

2017/2018

Agenda

April 9, 2018, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm

Engineering 285/287

- I. **Call to Order and Roll Call –**
- II. **Approval of Minutes:**
Senate Minutes of March 12, 2018.
- III. **Communications and Questions:**
 - A. From the Chair of the Senate
 - B. From the President of the University
- IV. **Executive Committee Report:**
 - A. Minutes of the Executive Committee
Executive Committee Minutes of March 5, 2018
Executive Committee Minutes of March 19, 2018
 - B. Consent Calendar –
 - C. Executive Committee Action Items –
Approval of the Elections Calendar for Spring 2019
- V. **Unfinished Business:**
 - A. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
AS 1688, Policy Recommendation, Rescind F83-10 Entry- Level Mathematics (ELM) Examination; Sanctions; Probation (First Reading)

AS 1689, Policy Recommendation, Rescind S80-9 Resource Analysis Required for Curricular Proposals (First Reading)
 - B. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
AS 1686, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds S66-11, College Reports to Selective Service Boards (Final Reading)
 - C. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
AS 1690, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to S13-6 (Campus Awards) To Provide for System Award Nominations (First Reading)
 - D. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
AS 1678, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to S17-6, Departmental Voting Rights (Final Reading)
- VI. **Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation)**
 - A. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
AS 1693, Policy Recommendation, Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Committee (First Reading)
 - B. University Library Board (ULB):
AS 1692, Sense of the Senate Resolution, To Support Open Access Publishing and Promote the Retention of Author Rights Among SJSU Faculty (First Reading)

- C. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
AS 1691, Policy Recommendation, Rescind S09-5, Priority Registration (First Reading)

AS 1694, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy S14-10 Master's Committee Structure and Processes and Thesis Embargoes (First Reading)

AS 1695, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to F88-9 BA/BS Differentiation and Definition (First Reading)

- D. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
AS 1696, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to S17-13, Undergraduate Student Honors at SJSU (First Reading)
- E. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
AS 1682, Policy Recommendation, Declaring our Support for Academic Freedom, Establishing the Academic Freedom Committee, and amending S99-8 (Final Reading)

AS 1683, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to F81-7 "Appointment Procedures for Grant-Related Instructional Faculty of Exceptional Merit" (GRIF) (Final Reading)

VII. State of the University Announcements:

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

VIII. Special Committee Reports:

Report on Athletics by Professor Annette Nellen, Chair, Athletics Board, Professor Sen Chiao, the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR), Marie Tuite, the Director of Athletics, Jacquelyn Duysen, Associate Athletics Director for Compliance, and Eileen Dailey, Senior Associate Athletics Director, Student-Athlete Academic Services, Time Certain: 2:30 p.m.

IX. New Business:

X. Adjournment:

2017/2018 Academic Senate

**MINUTES
March 12, 2018**

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

Ex Officio:

Present: Frazier, Van Selst, Manzo,
Lee, J., Rodan

CASA Representatives:

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

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Wong(Lau), Willey,
Feinstein
Absent: Papazian, Faas

COB Representatives:

Present: Bullen, He, Jensen
Absent: None

Deans:

Present: Elliott, Stacks, Ehrman,
Jacobs

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Marachi, Mathur
Absent: None

Students:

Present: Busick
Absent: De Guzman, Hospidales,
Donahue, Gill, Norman

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Chung, Pyeon, Sullivan-Green
Absent: None

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters

H&A Representatives:

Present: Khan, Riley, McKee, Bacich, Ormsbee
Absent: None

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

SCI Representatives:

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

Honorary Representative:

Present: Lessow-Hurley

SOS Representatives:

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

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Trousdale, Matoush,
Higgins
Absent: Kauppila

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

The minutes of February 12, 2018 were approved.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Frazier announced that there are Senate elections right now in CASA and Business through this Friday, February 16, 2018. All election results will be announced at the April 9, 2018 Senate meeting.

We also have a CSU Statewide Senator election taking place and nominating petitions are due this Wednesday, February 14, 2018. We already have three nominees, so we will be conducting an election after nominations close.

Once all elections have concluded, we will send out the Committee Preference Form. All Senators are placed on the policy committees first, so fill the Committee Preference Form out quickly.

The President is at the American Council of Education Meeting in Washington and will not be here today.

B. From the President of the University – Not present.

IV. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

Executive Committee Minutes of February 5, 2018

Q: Item number 4 under the Professional Standards Committee update states that, “PS has started a conversation on bullying.” What kind of bullying is this; faculty-to-faculty, faculty-to-student, student-to-student, etc.?

A: General, but there is a subcommittee that is meeting and talking about the issues. The CDO has met with them. We don’t know if this will result in policy changes, or just raising awareness. Faculty-on-Faculty bullying on campus falls through the cracks in many policies and the PS Committee is trying to figure out what can be done to raise awareness.

Executive Committee Minutes of February 19, 2018 – No questions.

B. Consent Calendar:

The consent calendar of March 12, 2018 was approved as amended by AVC Riley.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

The Senate Calendar of 2018-2019 was approved. Chair Frazier announced that the Retreat is February 1, 2019. Chair Frazier also announced that there is no Senate or Executive Committee meeting scheduled the week of Thanksgiving. As a note, Spring break falls on the first week of April in 2019.

Q: Was the calendar checked to be sure it did not conflict with any major religious holidays?

A: Yes, we did check.

Chair Frazier presented *AS 1687, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Honoring Professor Yoshihiro Uchida for His 70 years of Service to San José State University (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1687 passed unanimously**

V. Unfinished Business: None

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

A. University Library Board (ULB): None

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

Senator Schultz-Krohn presented *AS 1675, Policy Recommendation: Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity: Advisor-Student Relationship, Sponsored Projects, and Proprietary and Confidential Information in RSCA (Final Reading)*.

Senator Schultz-Krohn presented an amendment that was friendly to add “the” on line 92 after “enrich.” Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to add the following sentence at the end of the first paragraph under section II.B.1. The added sentence reads, “Individuals from outside San José State University may serve as Co-PI upon approval by the AVP for Research.” The amendment was seconded.

The Senate voted and the Shifflett amendment passed unanimously. Senator Peter explained that portions of University Policy F69-12 are in conflict with AS 1675. Senator Peter made a motion to refer back to committee with instructions to incorporate University Policy F69-12 into this policy. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the Peter motion failed (4-41-0). **Senator Stacks presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to strike line 304.** This is the last line of the fourth bullet under Section III.B., second paragraph that reads, “It should not be interpreted as a final agreement.” **The Senate voted and AS 1675 passed as amended (36-5-4).**

Senator Schultz-Krohn presented *AS 1676, Policy Recommendation, Department or School Name Change (Final Reading)*.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to line 26 to add at the end of this sentence, “and a summary of the feedback from each academic unit consulted.” **The Senate voted and AS 1676 was approved as amended unanimously.**

Senator Schultz-Krohn presented *AS 1688, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds F83-10, ELM Exam; Sanctions; Probation (First Reading)*

The O&G Committee has been sending many policies that need to be rescinded to the various policy committees for their review and this is one of those policies. EO 1110 discontinued offering entry level mathematics or (ELM) and what that did was render F83-10 inactive. C&R is asking the body to rescind that policy.

Questions:

Q: Is this policy recommendation consistent with the Sense of the Senate Resolution we passed that expressed sympathy with other campuses around EO 1110 and the top-down elimination of the way that we do things at SJSU? It may be that the Chancellor said that we have to do this, but I don’t know that it is actually proper. Do you think it is proper? Do we just change our policy because they said so?

A: I’m not sure whether I can entertain whether or not I think that it’s proper. I think that it would definitely be an advantage to have things at a local level and generate them at a local level, so in that aspect it would be not proper. However, the effect is that EO 1110 has discontinued ELM, so the existing policy on the books

that requires students to take the ELM in their first semester of enrollment is in conflict with EO 1110. The issue that you are bringing up is an entirely different issue to undertake about the proper direction. What we are faced with today is a policy that requires students to take a test for something in their first semester that no longer exists.

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

Senator Sullivan Green presented *AS 1684, Policy Recommendation, Rescind S66-20, Control of Information Contained in Student Records (Final Reading)*.

Senator Rodan made a motion to suspend the rules and make AS 1684 a First Reading. The motion was seconded. **The Senate voted and the Rodan motion passed with 5 abstentions.**

Senator Sullivan-Green presented *AS 1685, Amendment A to S16-9, Section A, to include accessible syllabus template requirement, and Section B.1.e. to include expected hourly commitment for each unit of credit (Final Reading)*.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to lines 37 and 38 to strike, “and use the appropriate syllabus template format provided by the University.” The amendment was seconded. Senator Sen presented an amendment to the Shifflett amendment to change it to read, “and/or use the appropriate syllabus template format provided by the University to create their syllabus.” The Sen amendment to the Shifflett amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Sen amendment failed. Senator Mathur called the question on the Shifflett amendment. The Senate voted and the Mathur motion passed with 4 Nays and No Abstentions. ***The Senate voted and the Shifflett amendment passed with 7 Nays, and 1 Abstention.***

Senator Chin presented an amendment to add at the end of line 69, “, as an example, the expectation of work for a 3-unit course is 150 minutes of direct faculty instruction and 6 hours of out of class student work each week.” The Chin amendment was seconded. Senator Lee presented an amendment to the Chin amendment to replace “credit” with “unit.” The Lee amendment to the Chin amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Lee amendment to the Chin amendment passed with 8 Nays and 4 Abstentions. The Senate voted and the Chin/Lee Amendment failed. Senator Rodan presented an amendment to line 65 to strike, “with 1 of the hours used for lecture” and replace it with, “including time used for lecture.” The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Rodan Amendment failed with 4 Yea and 1 Abstention. Senator Ormsbee presented an amendment to strike “(with 1 of the hours used for lecture).” Senator Buzanski called the question. The Senate voted and the Buzanski motion passed. ***The Senate voted and the Ormsbee Amendment passed with 5 Nays and 7 Abstentions.*** Senator Buzanski called the question. The Senate voted and the Buzanski motion passed. **The Senate voted on AS 1685 as amended and it passed with 1 Nay and No Abstentions.**

D. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

Senator Peter presented *AS 1682, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to S99-*

8, Declaring our Support for Academic Freedom, Establishing the Academic Freedom Committee (First Reading).

Professor Annette Nellen (former Senate Chair) asked that a reference be made to *Sweezy v. New Hampshire*, 354 U.S. 234 (1957) which says, “Teachers and students must always remain free to inquire, to study, and to evaluate to gain new maturity and understanding otherwise our civilization will stagnate and die.” This is one of the key court decisions to uphold academic freedom. We will be including this.

Currently we have a policy that includes both academic freedom and professional responsibility together including both the campus ethics code and statements on academic freedom. We also have one board that handles both academic freedom and professional responsibility issues. That board has not been effective over the last 25 years. It has had too divided of a mission. PS has been eager to make it more effective and focused. The strategy that PS decided to take is to separate academic freedom and professional responsibility. This is the first step in that process. The language on academic freedom that you see on the policy is unchanged from what was on the existing policy on academic freedom and that language is almost word-for-word from the classic AAUP statements on academic freedom and tenure. In 1993 we took the AAUP statements and slightly revised them to put SJSU into those paragraphs and then we put those paragraphs into the overall new policy.

The new sections are sections 2 and 3. They establish the Academic Freedom Committee as a Special Agency. The Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR) is a large board and it has been nearly impossible to fill all the seats. It has typically only been half filled each year. PS thought having a smaller committee of experts would be much better. There are already rules in the bylaws for how special agencies are to be staffed. The role of this Academic Freedom Committee is mainly educational. Its role is to tell faculty and students about Academic Freedom, and to also work with the Center for Faculty Development to advise and orient new faculty on academic freedom issues.

Professor Nellen, who is a past chair of the Senate and also an attorney, has volunteered to be on the committee. PS is going to try an experiment by having one of the members of the board be an emeritus faculty member. In part PS chose this because it has been difficult to get members, but also because it would be so very beneficial to have a senior and experienced individual that know a great deal about academic freedom on the committee. PS also felt that the committee should have an administrator on it. In the future, PS will be bringing a similar policy on professional responsibility.

Questions:

Q: It strikes me that academic freedom should be very central to the Senate, and pushing it to a special agency seems to indicate a peripheral rather than central focus. Would the committee consider pushing some of the work from committees like C&R or PS that is more implementation-based to supporting committees and

instead leave the principal work of policy and policy statements to the central work of the Senate.

A: There is no provision in the draft for the Academic Freedom Committee to be drafting policy. That remains with PS. This is primarily an educational and advisory committee. PS could change that if you think it is advisable.

Q: It may be then just a different title is needed.

A: PS will discuss this.

Q: Once upon a time there was a chapter of the AAUP here. I know this because the charter said you could only be chair for two years and Senator Norton and Senator Buzanski took turns chairing this committee. One function this group had was when faculty members had some administrative difficulties with academic freedom or were being charged with certain irregularities in their teaching or what not, our local chapter of AAUP would come to their defense. Since you have also mentioned that organization here in your report might the Academic Freedom Committee consider recreating that group? In fact, the AAUP was abolished on this campus at the same time collective bargaining came into effect. At that point all the subsidiary organizations that were opposed to collective bargaining ceased to exist.

A: We tried to nod to the AAUP and we have occasionally invited various members of the AAUP to address the Senate, and it has always been very enlightening and helpful. It does seem to be the repository of documents about academic freedom, so we would encourage the Academic Freedom Committee to maintain a relationship with the AAUP.

Q: Instead of having just one student, would the committee consider having two students; an Undergraduate and a Graduate Student?

A: The committee will consider it.

Q: Can you talk about professional responsibility and the association with academic freedom and how we can strengthen that relationship in this document, or why it is being separated out? How will the faculty members be selected?

A: There is a deep and important relationship between academic freedom and professional responsibility. When Senator Peter first joined the Senate there was a separate Academic Freedom Committee and there was no professional responsibility document. PS crafted a professional responsibility document and attached them together to demonstrate symbolically the relationship between the two. The problem wasn't with that symbolic association. The problem was with that committee. There was not an effective group on campus to educate faculty about academic freedom on the one hand and the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility did not always have the power to really police or publicize professional responsibilities. PS put out some language linking the statement on academic freedom in section 2 to the policies on professional responsibility. PS wants to have the best of both worlds. They want to make sure people understand that tenure is a privilege that carries with it responsibilities, and that academic freedom is a privilege that carries with it some responsibilities. PS also wants to have effective committees that get their work done. With regard to the membership,

there is an agreed upon method for filling seats on special agencies. The nominees come to the Executive Committee and the Executive Committee reviews the nominees and then they go to the Senate for approval.

Q: Once approved is it policy that applies to lecturers as well as permanent faculty? And, to what extent do we envision academic freedom for part-time faculty? Also, in line 77 there is a statement regarding academic freedom. Is this measurable or observable long term?

A: Absolutely, academic freedom is applicable to all faculty and students whether they are tenured or not. Tenure is a privilege that allows a faculty member perhaps to do a better job of defending it when standing up in an unpopular situation to outsiders when there is an attack on academic freedom. The AAUP was founded a little after the turn of the 20th century for their political views. Tenure was necessary to prevent that from occurring. Faculty need to have someone to watch out and alert us if academic freedom is attacked. I am not sure it is measurable in a quantitative way, but it is something that experts can recognize and look at precedent. You would have a level of expertise that would be available to advise people that currently may be lacking.

Q: Looking in the bylaws, the only thing I'm finding about the membership is that at-large faculty members will be nominated by the Committee on Committees. I don't see anything in particular about special agencies and in particular the special agencies. Would the committee consider spelling out the membership?

A: PS will scrutinize this and be more specific about the membership selection when the policy is brought back for a second reading.

Q: Would you take back to the committee, regarding line 101, that there might come a time when we run out of people with both expertise and interest in serving on the committee and instead have it say expertise, or interest?

A: PS will consider this.

Senator Buzanski presented a motion to suspend the rules and move the agenda to University Announcements. The Buzanski motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the Buzanski motion failed (18-14-5) (Note: 2/3^{rds} vote required)

Senator Peter presented *AS 1683, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to F81-7, "Appointment Procedures for Grant-Related Instructional Faculty of Exceptional Merit" (GRIF) (First Reading)*.

There is a category of faculty on campus called Grant-Related Instructional Faculty. There are only two such faculty at SJSU. This program goes back to 1981. When the argument was made that we ought to be able to pay certain faculty more than the collective bargaining agreement would allow provided that money came from non-general fund sources. However, the CSU policy that established this said that if you are going to partake in this you need a campus policy that allows this process. Our campus policy was passed in 1981. What we have done is try to provide an updated version. This amendment updates the policy and brings us into alignment with the

coded memorandum that the CSU issued that regulates this particular program. There were no questions.

E. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1680, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds S90-13 (At Large Committee Appointments) (Final Reading)*.

The Senate voted and AS 1680 was approved unanimously.

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1681, Policy Recommendation, Rescind F71-14: Acting Appointments: Vice Presidents or Deans (Final Reading)*.

The Senate voted and AS 1681 passed with No Nays and 1 Abstention.

VII. State of the University Reports:

A. Provost: N/A

B. Vice President for Administration and Finance: N/A

C. Vice President for Student Affairs: N/A

D. Chief Diversity Officer: N/A

E. CSU Faculty Trustee (by standing invitation): N/A

F. Statewide Academic Senators: N/A

G. AS President: N/A

VIII. Special Committee Reports:

Report on SOTES by Chair of the Student Evaluation Review Board (SERB), Dr. Emily Slusser and Chair of the Professional Standards Committee, Senator Kenneth Peter, and Scott Heil, Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics in accordance with SS-S05-6, Time Certain: 3:00 p.m.

Dr. Slusser reported that there is a new data collection software for our SOTES and SOLATES that can be accessed in My SJSU, or you can access it via Canvas, where it will show up on the menu on the left-hand side. When you access it via Canvas you will see an ongoing report on the response rates. You can also click on the green button in the middle of the page that says view report. If you did that for any given class you would see a report of the mean or average responses to each of the questions as compared to the department (in yellow) and the entire university (in red), and also the percentile rank. Below that are open-ended responses. You will see all your strengths on one screen followed by a screen with all your weaknesses. If you click on the magnifying glass when looking at your open-ended responses, you will see a page with all of that student's responses. This helps you understand where that one student was coming from, and how that student could have impacted your scores. This is a new feature in this particular system.

Something that SERB is still working on with this system is that when you want to find the college norm, you have to access the report a little differently. In this case, you go to the little wheel on the right side of the screen and it gives you options. If you view all of your report, it will take you into the course evaluation system, and then it should have all your SOTES and SOLATES over the last few semesters. At that point when you click to export it as a pdf, you would not only get the same information you got when

you accessed it in Canvas, but you would also get additional information. First, you get the average course grade. Next, you get the average grade of the students who completed the survey as compared to the average grade of the students that didn't complete the survey. This is interesting information we did not have before. Then if you scroll down from there you get the college norms. The current state is that we can only compare the individual mean for any given class to the department and university norm. SERB is working on it. The college norms are at the end of the report.

Just a quick comparison of the report we were using before and what we have now. Students and faculty used to see the course evaluation in Peoplesoft, but now we have the Course Evaluation System. This new system is really not a lot different from the student perspective, except that the Course Evaluation System has a mobile app.

Comparing the responses from Fall 2016 to the current responses for last semester, SERB has found that the response rate is comparable. There was a 73.5% response rate in Fall 2016 with Peoplesoft, and there was a 76.8% response rate last semester with the Course Evaluation System. What SERB is seeing here is that there isn't a dramatic decrease in the response rate. The response rate last semester is also comparable to the paper response rate. The response rate with paper SOTES and SOLATES was about 73%. Student responses to the questions have not changed much as well, even though the questions have been changed a little. The mean to question 13 in Peoplesoft was 4.1, and the mean with the Course Evaluation System is 4.3. However, the questions are a little different. In the past, SERB asked students, "Overall, this instructor's teaching was?" and now SERB is asking how much students agree with this statement, "Overall, the instructor's teaching was effective." In general, SERB is seeing a notable increase of about .2 per question using the new format.

Things that are new with the Course Evaluation System include short answer reports all being clustered by question, and the magnifying glass that allows faculty to see what any individual student reported. SERB anticipated a very quick turnaround this semester. While the turnaround was quicker, it was not as quick as SERB would have liked. Ultimately, SERB will be able to turn it around just as soon as the grades are released. SERB is going to use dynamic instead of static norms. SERB wants to make sure they are comparing the responses to the current semester. For every report it will be the current semester they are reporting on before they use the static norms. In the future, SERB will have the ability to track the response rates as they come in. That is a really important point, because then faculty will be able to send out reminders if their response rate is really low. What SERB is interested in doing is exploring that functionality and ultimately talking about removing the grade hold we have been using to incentivize students. Instead, faculty would remind their students to turn their SOTES in based on their response rates. SERB will have the ability to create optional mid semester surveys, and optional questions for individual departments or colleges as well.

Things that SERB is working on down the horizon include cross tabulating the responses by the grade earned in the class. That was on the previous report and we

don't have that right now. Also, the visual representation of the department, college, and university norms as we used to see them. We used to have a pretty good visualization of all of them and now we just have the two norms (department and university). SERB would like to get the college norm back in there. We are used to the 20 to 80 percentile range, and right now we have the exact percentile by which any individual would fall. This is a more nuanced report, but faculty are used to the other format so SERB is going to see if they can make this more consistent. SERB is also hoping to integrate the reports with efaculty so the two systems can talk to each other and faculty don't have to be bothered with uploading individual SOTES. SERB will also be publishing a new interpretation guide with the new questions and software. The last time the interpretation guide was updated was 2011.

Questions:

Q: In the past, we tried not to report anything with a really low sample size. Here when we are looking at the GPA of non-respondents or the GPA by grade with many classes you are going to get into those very, very thin numbers.

A: The GPA is by grades we've done, so we are just trying to get back to where we were with that. With regard to the nonresponse rate, we can suppress the report entirely if it doesn't meet the minimum number of respondents. Part of the interpretation guide that is embedded in this report does instruct people to be careful if it is a low sample size.

Q: Is there an ability to separate the SOTE scores by gender to establish norms?

A: We are trying to include a lot of factors in providing the context, so I don't know of a way to reduce it down to the norm so that providing that comparison would be feasible, but SERB is going to demonstrate the literature there.

Q: I looked up course eval and you said it is an app?

A: It is not an app you download, but it is mobile friendly. When it realizes you are using a mobile device, it will adjust the screen.

Q: We had institutional records that in the past held the data related to course evals and now the course eval program is integrated with Canvas, is it related to Canvas Labs at all?

A: It is the parent company.

Q: I went to Canvas Labs and looked for a privacy policy and I couldn't find one, so my question is when it is integrated with Canvas will it have any protections from the data being used or matched for students and faculty online behaviors? I have concerns given the way big data and analytics are being used and are very valuable to third party companies.

A: Sure. First, the level of integration between the course evaluation system and Canvas is very minimal. The data never actually enters Canvas. Also, we signed a privacy agreement with the company and it meets the CSU terms for these type of agreements.

Q: Thank you for coming. When we do special sessions there are all kinds of odd times they end in the semester. I haven't figured out a standard way to notify your

office there should be a SOTE, so I'm wondering if there is anything proposed for that? In addition, policy says that all classes will have norms, and will you find a way to re-implement the norms?

A: The norms are still there. They are just presented in different ways. We will look for additional ways to show the norms. Where faculty fall within the spectrum is probably the biggest thing missing, but numerically you have all the data there. We are working on getting the spectrum back. As far as special sessions, you can talk to us about that. We worked with business on developing a system for them to notify us about their special session classes.

Q: Dept. Chairs have to do evaluations on lecturers and must look at SOTES that need to be within the university norm range. The way I was able to do it is to go to page 4 and then flip back and forth between page 1 and 4 to compare. This probably added about 1.5 minutes to each evaluation. Is there a way to make this more visual?

A: We will be looking for ways to change it. There are some special problems for lecturers that we have made available for chairs, but did not publicize it. We included a streamlined report that lets you isolate all the lecturers into one table and you see their scores in one place for a period of time. We will be looking at additional ways to handle lecturers. We realize they are a special population. If you have additional feedback let us know.

Q: Do you include all student responses in this, or do you have a way of excluding students that were officially enrolled but got an unofficial withdrawal?

A: That is a special problem. Policy tells us that we should to the extent possible try and remove any respondents who withdrew either officially or unofficially from a class. It has been our policy to do that. One thing we realized in the way we import the GPA to the class, there is only one chance to either show a grade and a respondent or not show a grade and a respondent. We have chosen to include the WUs, because it would distort the GPA measurement of the report. There is a fairly strong correlation between average grade in the class and the SOTE scores. We think that the importance of you seeing the relationship, if that is bringing down the class average grade, is more important than the effect of potential students that weren't hanging around long in the class, but decided to take the SOTE in the end anyway.

Report on Board of General Studies (BOGS) Activity for 2016-2017 by the Chair of BOGS, Senator Simon Rodan, and the Chair of the Curriculum and Research Committee, Senator Winifred Schultz-Krohn.

Senator Rodan commented that it was an honor to serve as the Chair of BOGS. Over the last few years BOGS has begun to think of General Education (GE) as a program as opposed to a collection of 352 courses in the catalog. When you think about it, GE represents about 40% of all the time students spend in class. In addition, GE as a program has about 30,000 enrolled students. That makes it a significant undertaking. We did a survey as part of our self-study about two years ago. One thing that emerged from that was the perception of GE across campus from both faculty and students as

something that simply had to be gotten out of the way, or a number of boxes that had to be checked before students could get on with their major. That is a perception we need to change. We have been looking at a number of campuses throughout the CSU and the way they present GE. One of the most striking things is that when you can find GE listed for the campuses, it states that these are the requirements and not learning opportunities.

Senator Rodan came from the British education system which does not have any GE component, so he spent his entire UG degree in math and physics courses. What he has come to realize while at SJSU is how much richer his education would have been if he had the opportunity to take some of the courses he sees in our GE program. One of the first things we need to think about if we are going to change this perception on campus is reimagining the website. We've got to sell GE as something students want to do and not something they have to do. One of the things that came out of the external reviewer's report is that they were less than enthusiastic about our assessment protocol. BOGS is going to revisit what they are assessing and how that assessment is being done, and in particular ensure this is done collaboratively. BOGS is hoping to reach out to coordinators to reach out regarding assessment. In addition, Kathleen McConnell is working on GE Pathways and as those are being generated, they are going to be presented to both BOGS and C&R.

Questions:

Q: In the Self Study section of the report, one of the key issues was the governance structure and system of program oversight which was found lacking. What are the plans to address that?

A: I think that is under the structural changes.

Q: Okay, so what are the plans?

A: There aren't any, this is what BOGS hopes to accomplish. Senator Rodan is a big proponent of the Japanese process of going out and seeking a consensus development.

C: I am a course coordinator for lower GE and I'm interested in the view of GE you speak of. I have faculty that often don't want to teach GE, so lecturers are left to teach it. We need a real cultural change.

Q: I was wondering if you could share more about the GE Pathways and what that is would look like?

A: C&R has not had a presentation yet, so I'm not sure what it is going to look like. I was just contacted over the weekend that this will be coming soon.

Q: I would like to know what is meant by the comment that the assessment process is too granular? Also, has EO 1100 has impacted BOGS thinking?

A: Starting with the question about granular assessment, we really don't do any assessment at the program level. One of the things we are thinking about doing is reimagining assessment less to do with the area objective and leaving that much more to the internal process and course coordinator level and focusing assessment on the program level objective. As for EO 1100, we approved a number of courses last fall to

address the transition on qualitative reasoning portion where we were still using the non-credit bearing courses prior to entry. There has been a huge amount of controversy about the way EO 1110 and 1100 were rolled out, but that is a separate issue. We are in a much better position here at SJSU with stretch English. My understanding is that we will be ready by the Fall of this year on the quantitative/Math side.

Q: Did the GE Pathways come from a faculty referral?

A: This is something that came through Graduate and Undergraduate Programs (GUP) and that Kathleen McConnell is working on and has asked for consultation with the C&R Committee. C&R suggested that since it is GE Pathways it also needs to go through BOGS. This request just came over the weekend.

Q: When I chaired C&R last year, we had a presentation on GE Pathways and it is coming from an administrator and not faculty perspective. GE Pathways is not a new idea we've had versions of it in the past. There were many questions when this was brought up last year and we presented them. Maybe it would be helpful to tell the Senators where BOGS falls in the Senate reporting structure, because BOGS does not direct report to C&R.

A: BOGS is a standalone special agency and does not direct report to C&R. However, there is consultation between C&R and BOGS. In this particular case it just so happens that the Chair of BOGS, Senator Rodan, also sits on C&R so we have not only the consultation but also the regular communication between BOGS and C&R.

C: GE Pathways originated three or four years ago when we had three different groups in Academic Affairs dealing with strategic initiatives. There was a combined administrator and faculty team that was listed on the Provost website.

C: That is my recollection as well. I was a faculty member that sat in on some discussions.

IX. New Business: None

X. Adjournment: 5:00 p.m.

Executive Committee Minutes
March 5, 2018, 2018
Noon – 1:30 p.m., ADM 167

Present: Shifflett, Manzo, Schultz-Krohn, Mathur, Lee, Feinstein, Sullivan-Green, Wong(Lau), Riley, Peter, Faas, Papazian

Absent: Frazier, Manzo, Van Selst

1. The minutes of February 19, 2018 were approved as amended.
2. There was no dissent to the consent calendar of March 5, 2018 as amended.
3. Update from the President:
The President will be attending CSU Advocacy Day on March 7, 2018 in Sacramento. The President reminded committee members that the CSU has a \$171 million budgetary gap between the budget the Governor is proposing and what the CSU needs to operate.

The Board of Trustees (BOT) meet at the end of the month and one item on the agenda is a tuition increase. No one wants a tuition increase, but the budget gap is very large. The legislature is supportive, but the question is whether they will vote on something to push this for us.

President Papazian will be having conversations this week with gubernatorial candidates.

Questions:

Q: Many faculty members have heard it will be a tough budget year, but don't seem to realize just how much of a challenge it will be. Can communication on campus be more specific with respect to the deficit between the Governor's budget and what the CSU needs?

A: President Papazian is planning town hall meetings on campus in the next month or so and will be sharing the numbers. Without substantial change by the legislature, programs such as student success initiatives and faculty hiring will be affected.

The President asked if there were any questions or suggestions regarding the incident with the graffiti on the DMH bathroom wall.

Q: Will there be any revisions to the communications strategy after what happened with students spreading the information all over social media before UPD notified the campus?

A: The President and her cabinet have reviewed every minute of the event in detail and will be making adjustments.

Q: The smart clocks did not put out any information about the event. We need some standard place we can check for credible information regarding events such as this.

A: Good point. UPD is working on the best way to notify people.

Q: We need a single voice and some training like the “Run-Fight-Hide” training we had.

A: Yes.

Q: Can we work on getting out something useful out by text or cellphone?

A: We are working on minimizing the confusion. Every aspect of the event is being evaluated.

Q: We had the Director of the Preschool calling to ask what they should do. Shouldn't we give priority to the young children on campus?

A: Q: We had the Director of the Preschool calling to ask what they should do. Could we give priority to the young children on campus? When there is a threat (credible/non-credible) could we notify the lab preschools to keep the children indoors?

4. The committee discussed and approved a Sense of the Senate Resolution Honoring Professor Yoshihiro Uchida (9-0-3).
5. The committee discussed, and approved by unanimous consent, an editorial change to bylaw 1.2. The words “General Unit” were omitted from University Policy S06-2, apparently erroneously. A memo will be sent to President Papazian with details for approval.
6. Updates:
 - a. From the Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
O&G will be bringing *AS 1678, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to S17-6, Departmental Voting Rights* to the Senate meeting on March 12, 2018 for a final reading.

O&G continues to work on policy clean-up recommendations.

b. From the Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):

C&R will be bringing *AS 1676, Policy Recommendation, Request by Department or School for a Name Change* and *AS 1675, Policy Recommendation, Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity: Advisor-Student Relationship, Sponsored Projects, and Proprietary and Confidential Information in RSCA* to the March 12, 2018 Senate meeting for final readings.

C&R is continuing to review the 18 referrals from O&G and prioritize them. There are four that require minimal action in the planning stages right now.

C&R has several other referrals that are pending including referrals on an undeclared undergraduate category, resource analysis curricular proposals, and a referral on who should be chair in the masters' committee structure.

C&R continues work on the 4+1 option for masters as well as reviewing programs such as Marine Biology.

c. From the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):

I&SA will be bringing a policy clean-up that rescinds an old policy pertaining to Selective Service to the Senate for a final reading at the March 12, 2018 Senate meeting.

I&SA will also be discussing two referrals regarding the syllabus today and hope to bring them to the March 12, 2018 Senate meeting as well.

d. From the Professional Standards Committee (PS):

PS will be bringing several policies for first reading to the March 12, 2018 Senate meeting including one on Grant-Related Instructional Faculty and one on Academic Freedom. The Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility functions will be revised in two separate pieces.

PS will also be bringing a revision to the faculty awards policy that incorporates the Wang Award. After speaking with the Chief of Staff, PS will not be including staff awards in the faculty awards policy.

7. O&G asked that the referral made to the Senate Chair regarding establishing student awards for service on the Senate be made a priority. The student member of O&G consulted with AS peers and concurred further investigation a good idea.

The Senate Administrator responded that there is already a University Policy that pertains to these awards and it is University Policy S97-4, University Governance Award. In addition, certificates of service are presented to all departing Senators at the end of the year.

8. University Updates:

- a. CSU Statewide Senators:

The CSU Statewide Senate will be discussing modality of instruction. This pertains to deans in some instances forcing lecturers to teach online courses. The Provost will do some investigation and develop a plan for online courses.

- b. From the Provost and Senior VP for Academic Affairs:

There will be a Celebration of Life Ceremony for Kate Sullivan at the Chapel at 3 p.m. today.

The Provost has met with the deans and they discussed the need for consistency in the message that goes out regarding an incident like the graffiti on the DMH bathroom wall.

Questions:

Q: Why are we a Carnegie Class R1 and not R3 for research?

A: We don't move ourselves Carnegie does. As far as why we aren't R2 or R3 it is because we have no research doctorates. You need 20 research doctorates for the R2 rating.

A: This is a reason for us to consider joint research degrees. Our Marine Science masters is a 3-year masters.

Q: Can we coordinate data collection on campus so that we are not doing the same surveys in different departments/committees?

A: This is why we have an analytics team that coordinates this for us.

- c. From the Chief Diversity Officer (CDO):

The CDO has a list of positions she is proposing for staffing the President's Commission on Inclusive Excellence. The purpose of the Commission is to assist the CDO to come up with activities and a strategic plan. Another part of

the charge will be annual awards to recognize good work in diversity across the campus.

The CDO will be at the Annual Diversity Officers in Higher Education workshop in Washington D.C. on Wednesday.

There is still a lot of conversation about what happened at Michigan State.

d. From the Vice President for Administration and Finance:

The UPD Chief has been offered a position in Los Gatos and may be leaving.

e. From the Vice President for Student Affairs:

This is Women's History Month.

SJSU admitted 8,000 transfer students and hopes to admit 3,600 freshmen.
Admitted Spartan Day is April 14, 2018.

Please register for the Student Success Symposium.

There has been an increase in ICE raids in the area.

f. From the Associated Students President: Not present

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

These minutes were transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on February 19, 2018. The minutes were reviewed and edited by the Senate Chair, Stefan Frazier, on March 12, 2018. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on March 19, 2018.

Executive Committee Minutes
March 19, 2018
Noon – 1:30 p.m., ADM 167

Present: Shifflett, Manzo, Schultz-Krohn, Mathur, Lee, Feinstein, Sullivan-Green, Wong(Lau), Riley, Peter, Faas, Papazian, Frazier, Manzo, Van Selst

Absent: None

1. The minutes of March 5, 2018 were approved as amended.
2. Update from the President:
The President has had a very busy week and attended the Institute for Sports Society and Social Change, the Student Success Summit, and the Business Higher Education Forum.

The President will be attending the Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting this week.

Questions:

Q: The Senate passed the Information Privacy policy and sent it to your office for review and approval in April of 2017. The policy has not been returned approved or disapproved. The PS Committee hasn't been consulted about any changes you might require before signing the policy, so can you comment on the status of this policy?

A: President Papazian apologized for the delay. The President will take another look at the policy, but is uncomfortable signing it as is.

Q: The Senate bylaws call for the President to respond promptly either approving or disapproving policies sent to her. PS spent a lot of time working on this policy and the members deserve a response one way or the other.

A: President Papazian will review the policy and either approve or disapprove it soon. The President did not want to just say no to the policy and wanted time to review and work on it, but other pressing issues on campus took priority.

Q: With Faculty Affairs moving under University Personnel some issues have arisen in my department with timekeeping. I am now being required to enter fractions of time for part time faculty. Faculty have always been treated as a separate type of employee in the past and this feels as if faculty are no longer being treated as a separate group.

A: If you have concerns check with the Jaye Bailey and she can direct you to the right folks to talk to.

3. The Executive Committee approved the Appointments Calendar for 2018.
4. The Executive Committee approved the Elections Calendar for Spring 2019.
5. The Executive Committee discussed Senate elections. A member asked why so much information was needed when voting in elections. The Senate Administrator responded that the information requested, such as the name, department/college, and appointment time for part time faculty is necessary so that the Senate Office can verify the votes are correct. The only personnel that view the votes are the Senate Administrator, the Senate Chair, and the Associate Vice Chair. A member suggested adding this information to the election material. The Senate Administrator will ensure this is done in the future.

A member asked if IEA could be asked about helping so that voters need only put in ID number. The Senate Administrator responded that the Committee on Committees (acting as the Election Committee) had looked into election software a few years ago after consulting with IEA. The result was that it was very expensive and would require additional university employees to administer.

6. Updates:

a. From the Associated Students President:

AS elections are underway and AS has 29 applicants this year.

AS is offering a 2-hour Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) training to anyone that would like to attend. The AS President asked what actions the university might take to assist students. The Executive Committee discussed. The CDO will host an event to raise awareness for students at the Undocumented Students Center. Faculty could be reminded that the university's official position is to call the University Police Department. President Papazian will also look into what information is on the webpage and have it updated.

AS has given out 281 book vouchers.

AS has given Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) funds to 20 students.

b. From the CSU Statewide Senate:

The CSU Statewide Senate is discussing mental health, tenure-density, and shared governance issues. In addition, EO 1100 and 1110 and their implementation continue to be discussed.

c. From the Provost:

The search for the Dean of the College of Education should be completed in the next day or two. The search for the Dean of the College of Science is progressing.

The Provost has been working on developing a program for sharing tenured faculty across campus.

d. From the Chief Diversity Officer (CDO):

Intergroup Dialogues continue every Friday.

The CDO is participating in pre-tenure workshops.

SJSU received a grant for Faculty Diversity from the CSU.

The search for a Title IX Coordinator is progressing.

e. From the Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF):

An incident occurred at a fraternity house in which the members called the University Police Department (UPD). UPD interviewed the student and called his parents. The parents took the student for treatment. Social media got a hold of this information and added to it so that it evolved into a story about a potential shooting at Peanuts, but none of it was true.

f. From the Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA):

The Student Success Symposium was a great success.

Winona LaDuke will be on campus tonight at 7 p.m. She was a Vice Presidential candidate and ran on the Green ticket.

This is Women's History month.

Next month is LGBT Pride month as well as Asian-American Women's month.

18,000 freshmen have been admitted.

Admitted Spartans Day is April 14, 2018.

7. Policy Committee Updates:

a. From the Professional Standards Committee (PS):

PS will be bringing the Academic Freedom policy to the Senate for a final reading at the April 9, 2018 meeting.

PS is also working on a Professional Responsibility policy to be brought to the Senate at a later date.

PS is researching bullying.

PS will be bringing a policy on RTP guidelines.

b. From the Organization and Government Committee (O&G):

O&G will be bringing an amendment to the voting rights policy to the Senate at the April 9, 2018 meeting.

c. From the Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):

C&R has been reviewing Marine Biology and the restructuring of Engineering degrees.

C&R continues to collaborate on the 4+1 blended BS-to-MS degree and is discussing with the UCCD.

C&R is also working on a referral regarding the chairs of thesis committees.

d. From the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):

I&SA is revisiting the question of policy S66-20 and trying to determine what should come first the Presidential Directive or the policy.

I&SA is reviewing the registration policy regarding students repeating classes.

8. The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

These minutes were transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on March 23, 2018. The minutes were reviewed and edited by the Senate Chair, Stefan Frazier, on March 23, 2018. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on April 2, 2018.

	Committee	Consent Calendar Last Name/First Name	9-Apr-18 Term	Phone	Seat/College
ADD:	Program Planning	Lee, Juneseok	2019	JUNESEOK LEE <juneseok.lee@sj>	M/ CoEng
	Writing Requirements Committee	Wells, Pamela	2021		CoB
	Writing Requirements Committee	McConnell, Kathleen	2021		CoSS
	Writing Requirements Committee	Frazier, Stefan	2021		H&A/LLD
	Writing Requirements Committee	Baer, Cindy	2019		H&A
	Student Fairness Committee	Khalil, Malaak	2018	malaak.khalil@sjsu.edu	Seat 2
	ULB	Ramsour, Mariah	2018	mariah.ramsour@gmail.com	Seat 2
REMOVE:	Student Fairness Committee	Castillo, Efrain	2018		Seat 2
	BOGS	Gonzales, Samantha	2018		Seat 1
	ADAPC	Woodhead, Erin	2020		Seat K



**SAN JOSÉ STATE
UNIVERSITY**

Academic Senate Office
ADM 176, 0024

GENERAL ELECTIONS
2019 Calendar

Timeline	Election Events
Thursday, January 31	Cover letter with instructions and petitions sent to all faculty. Petitions on line/attached.
Friday, February 22	Nominating petitions due in Senate Office (ADM 176).
Monday - Friday February 25 – March 1	Verification of petitions and preparation of online ballots.
Monday, March 4	Ballots online and info sent to faculty via college deans or directly or via college deans' offices electronically.
Friday, March 15	Online voting deadline 5 p.m.
Monday - Wednesday March 18 – March 20	Senate Administrator verifies appointment times for faculty that voted with College Deans' Offices.
Thursday - Friday March 21 – March 22	Final ballot count by the Senate AVC and Senate Administrator.
Monday, March 25	Results reported to Academic Senate.

Approved: March 16, 2018
Committee on Committees

Approved: March 19, 2018
Executive Committee

Approved: _____
Academic Senate

1 San Jose State University
2 Academic Senate
3 Organization and Government Committee
4 April 9, 2018
5 Final Reading
6

AS 1678

7 **Policy Recommendation**
8 **Amendment A to S17-6**
9 **(Departmental Voting Rights)**
10

11 Legislative History: This proposal would amend the policy on departmental voting rights
12 by specifying proportional voting for faculty who have entered the Faculty Early
13 Retirement Program (FERP) or Pre-Retirement Reduction in Time Base (PRTB)
14 Program. In addition, this proposal would add language related to the timely reporting
15 of the results of voting.
16

17 Whereas: The Senate recently approved proportional voting rights for faculty in
18 retirement programs (F17-3; Selection and Review of Department Chairs
19 and Directors), and
20

21 Whereas: It is important to have consistency across policies where feasible, and
22

23 Whereas: Timely communication related to the results of voting is important,
24 therefore be it
25

26 Resolved That an addition to section 3 of S17-6 (Departmental Voting Rights)
27 related to reporting of results be made and section 4.6 of S17-6 be
28 modified as follows:
29

30 3.5 Results of departmental voting must be reported to the department and to other
31 relevant stakeholders within ten working days after the close of the vote.
32

33 4.6 Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) and Pre-Retirement Reduction in
34 Time Base (PRTB). Faculty participating in FERP or PRTB retain departmental
35 voting rights proportional to their annualized appointment. They retain a full
36 proportional vote, regardless of their academic assignment in a given semester,
37 through the last semester of their teaching appointment.
38

39
40 Approved: 4/2/18
41 Vote: 8-0-0
42 Present: Bailey, French, Grosvenor, Hart, Higgins, Ormsbee,
43 Norman, Shifflett
44 Absent: Curry, Rajkovic, Ramasubramanian
45

46 Financial Impact: None
47 Workload Impact: None

48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

Rationale: The change to 4.6 will bring FERP and PRTB departmental voting into alignment with the recently approved policy on the Selection and Review of Department Chairs and Directors as there is no reason for votes to differ under these policies. In addition, the departmental voting rights policy is silent on the issue of timely reporting yet the information in many instances is central to future decision making and actions ranging from curriculum to program requirements, and the department's guidelines on departmental voting rights.

6
7
8
9
10 **Policy Recommendation**
11 **Amends University Policies S99-8 and S99-9**
12 **Declaring our Support for Academic Freedom and**
13 **Establishing the Academic Freedom Committee**

14 Resolved: That this policy be adopted effective immediately, with the Academic
15 Freedom Committee to be established by the beginning of AY 2018-19.

16 Resolved: Section I of S99-8 shall be deleted (as it is incorporated here unchanged.)
17 The title of S99-8 shall be changed from "Academic Freedom and
18 Professional Responsibility" to "Professional Responsibility."
19

20 Resolved: Throughout S99-9 the name of the "Board of Academic Freedom and
21 Professional Responsibility" shall be changed to the "Board of
22 Professional Responsibility." Items 1, 2, and 3 of its charge (related to the
23 education about Academic Freedom) will be deleted (as they are
24 incorporated here.)
25
26

27 Rationale: Academic Freedom is at the heart of the success of the modern university,
28 but in recent years faculty, students, and others have begun to lose touch
29 touch with a fulsome understanding of this critical concept. The classic
30 statements in defense of academic freedom were articulated at the start of
31 the twentieth century by the American Association of University Professors
32 (AAUP) in response to egregious acts in which faculty appointments,
33 research programs, and curricular content were attacked or manipulated
34 for political reasons. Faculty organized and fought hard to secure tenure
35 and other protections, and by the 1950s they won a key court decision that
36 eloquently summarized the need for academic freedom. "Teachers and
37 students must always remain free to inquire, to study and to evaluate, to
38 gain new maturity and understanding; otherwise our civilization will
39 stagnate and die."¹ [[Sweezy v. New Hampshire](#), 34 U.S. 234, 250 (1957)]
40

41 Today, however, many faculty and others are apt not to know much about
42 the history of academic freedom, nor its legal status, nor its ultimate
43 purpose. When the term is used it is sometimes perceived incorrectly as

1." [[Sweezy v. New Hampshire](#), 34 U.S. 234, 250 (1957)]

44 an individual privilege rather than as a critically important tool for fulfilling
45 the academy's scholarly and educational roles. Professional Standards
46 believes it is the responsibility of each new generation of faculty to take on
47 the challenge of renewing the community's understanding of academic
48 freedom, and has crafted this policy recommendation to fulfill this task.
49

50 A generation ago, the Academic Senate combined the Academic Freedom
51 Committee with a new board focused on professional ethics. The
52 motivation was sound—to symbolize the deep interconnection of
53 academic freedom to professional responsibility. We continue to agree
54 with this principle, but experience has taught that the Board of Academic
55 Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR) has not been a
56 consistently effective committee. Its sweeping responsibilities, extended
57 membership, and restricted qualifications have resulted in a committee
58 that is rarely filled and which is torn between its educational and its quasi-
59 judicial functions. As a result, the BAFPR has been the subject of review
60 and reform by Professional Standards for 4 years, with numerous starts
61 and stops and no resolution to the problems. After extensive consultation,
62 Professional Standards is determined to solve this problem, and this policy
63 recommendation is the first of two important steps.
64

65 This policy recommendation removes the educational functions centered
66 on Academic Freedom from BAFPR and gives them to a new Academic
67 Freedom Committee (AFC.) The AFC will be much smaller than the
68 Board and its qualifications for membership less restrictive. (BAFPR
69 consists solely of full Professors elected from each College.) By creating
70 a smaller committee with a sharper focus, Professional Standards hopes
71 to create a vibrant, active committee of experts that can engage in the
72 continual education of the university on academic freedom issues, and
73 provide useful and timely information to faculty, students, and
74 administration when issues related to academic freedom arise.
75

76 Other features of this reform are to pull the eloquent AAUP derived
77 statements on Academic Freedom and Tenure into this policy creating the
78 Academic Freedom Committee, so that the AFC's charge will be obviously
79 connected to its structure. We have added a section on professional
80 responsibility that underlines the interconnection between freedom and
81 responsibility and links to the (retitled) Professional Responsibility policy.
82

83 The creation of the AFC will nevertheless leave another reform of the
84 Board of Professional Responsibility to be taken up in a second stage.
85 The most effective way to enforce our campus policy on professional
86 responsibility, given the collective bargaining system and the growing

87 importance of legal codes operating within the academy, has yet to be
88 decided. The existing Board is advisory to Faculty Affairs and has had
89 mixed success over the years with this function. Furthermore, the
90 statement the statement of professional responsibility is itself in need of
91 revision after twenty years of legal developments. But Professional
92 Standards would like to see an effective and functioning AFC in place
93 while our work continues on the (now) separate professional responsibility
94 policy.

95
96
97 *Approved: (April 2, 2018)*

98
99 *Vote: (8-0-0)*

100
101 *Present: (Chin, He, Marachi, Kauppila, McKee, White, Peter, Kimbarow)*

102
103 *Absent: (Donahue, Pyeon)*

104
105 *Financial Impact: There could be some modest travel costs associated with sending*
106 *members of the Academic Freedom committee to conferences.*

107
108 *Workload Impact: The creation of a new committee would represent more work,*
109 *although necessary work. This is somewhat obviated by the work that could be saved if*
110 *the committee's actions prevent misunderstandings or incidents arising from disputes*
111 *over academic freedom.*

112 **Policy Recommendation**
113 **Academic Freedom at SJSU**
114

115 1. Statement of Academic Freedom²
116

117 1.1. In General
118

119 1.1.1. The primary mandates of a university—the discovery and dissemination of
120 knowledge and understanding, are absolutely dependent upon academic
121 and intellectual freedom. Freedom in research is fundamental to the
122 advancement of truth. Freedom in teaching is fundamental for the
123 protection of the rights of the student in learning and of the faculty³ in
124 teaching.
125

126 1.1.2. San José State University has a responsibility to society to defend and to
127 maintain these freedoms, and to ensure that those engaged in academic
128 pursuits can effectively execute their responsibilities. SJSU faculty must
129 remain free of the forces of special interests and political interference if they
130 are to fulfill society's expectations and their educational responsibilities.
131

132 1.2. Academic Freedom as it Relates to Tenure
133

134 1.2.1. Tenure constitutes the procedural safeguard of academic freedom and
135 individual responsibility and, as such, is essential for the maintenance of
136 intellectual liberty and high standards in education and in scholarship. It is
137 the means by which university faculty members are protected against
138 personal malice or political coercion, and by which it is ensured that those
139 who, following rigorous evaluation, secure continuing employment, can be
140 dismissed only on professional grounds according to due process.
141

142 1.2.2. Historically, the indispensability of academic tenure to academic freedom
143 in universities throughout the world has been proven by events in situations
144 where tenure has not existed. We must not forget the lessons of the past
145 but must work to insure that SJSU continues to fulfill the educational needs
146 of a free society.
147

² Derived from the *International Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, 1984. Signatories include the American Association of University Professors, the American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association, and similar groups from the United Kingdom, New Zealand, Canada, Australia, Ireland, and France. Section 1 is unchanged from S99-8 and previously from S93-12.

³ The faculty of the university include all those who engage in scholarly activities and/or those who directly or indirectly participate in instructional activity. Thus faculty members include professors, lecturers, teaching assistants, research assistants, coaches, counselors, librarians, and all those faculty employees under Unit 3.

148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186

1.3. Academic Freedom as it Relates to Professional Responsibility

1.3.1. Professional responsibility is the natural complement of the academic freedom essential to the university's mission. Through their responsible professional conduct, faculty members promote and protect academic freedom. Since faculty members belong to a profession with the rights of self-government, they also have the obligation to establish standards of professional conduct and procedures to enforce them. These standards are set in the SJSU Statement of Professional Responsibility.⁴

1.3.2. Academic freedom is a privilege granted to faculty in return for their obligation to serve the public good, which they do through the advancement of scholarship, the search for truth, and the higher education of our communities. We agree with the AAUP 1915 Declaration that “not only that the profession will earnestly guard those liberties without which it cannot rightly render its distinctive and indispensable service to society, but also that it will with equal earnestness seek to maintain such standards of professional character, and of scientific integrity and competency, as shall make it a fit instrument for that service.”⁵

2. The Academic Freedom Committee is established as a Special Agency.

2.1. Charge of the Academic Freedom Committee (AFC):

2.1.1. AFC shall monitor the state of academic freedom and shall serve as an advisory body on issues arising from the application of academic freedom on our campus.

2.1.2. AFC shall engage in the continual education of the university on academic freedom issues. To do so, AFC shall familiarize itself with policies, laws, court decisions, and current events concerning academic freedom. As part of this function it shall maintain contact (and membership if possible) with the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and familiarize itself with relevant AAUP publications. Members of AFC should attend AAUP conferences on academic freedom when possible.

2.1.3. AFC shall work in concert with the Center for Faculty Development to educate and orient new faculty on academic freedom issues, by attending and presenting at events such as faculty orientations.

⁴ S99-8 at the time of this policy recommendation
⁵ American Association of University Professors, *1915 Declaration of Principles on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure*.

187
188 2.1.4. AFC shall educate all constituencies of the San Jose State Community on
189 our own policies on academic freedom. It shall host at least one academic
190 freedom forum each year, on a topic related to academic freedom and
191 designed to stimulate interest in academic freedom.
192

193 3. Organization of the AFC

194 3.1. Membership

195 3.1.1. Three faculty members, two of whom must be (or have previously been)
196 tenured, chosen university-wide for their expertise and/or interest in
197 academic freedom issues. One of the three faculty may be from among our
198 emeriti faculty. One of the three faculty may be a lecturer or a probationary
199 faculty member. These faculty will serve 2 years terms and may be
200 renewed twice (for a total of six years) before rotating off the committee for a
201 minimum of one term.

202 3.1.2. One student.

203 3.1.3. One administrator.

204 3.2. Chair. Each year the AFC shall choose its own Chair from among the tenured
205 (or previously tenured) faculty members of the committee.

206 3.3. Reporting.

207 3.3.1. If the AFC has suggestions for policy changes it shall report them to the
208 Professional Standards Committee of the Academic Senate.

209 3.3.2. The Chair of the AFC shall be permitted to address the Professional
210 Standards Committee and the Academic Senate to report on issues relating
211 to academic freedom.

212 3.4. Selection

213 3.4.1. All candidates for membership shall submit statements discussing their
214 expertise and/or interest in academic freedom issues, and (if faculty) a
215 curriculum vitae.

216 3.4.2. Faculty candidates for membership shall be screened by the Executive
217 Committee and approved by the Senate.

218 3.4.3. The Administrative representative shall be designated by the President
219 after consultation with the Executive Committee.

220 3.4.4. The student representative shall be designated by Associated Students
221 after consultation with the Executive Committee.
222

6
7
8 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
9 **Amendment A to F81-7**
10 **“Appointment Procedures for Grant-Related Instructional**
11 **Faculty of Exceptional Merit” (GRIF)**

12
13
14 Resolved: That F81-7 be amended with the revisions shown, effective immediately.

15
16 *Rationale: F81-7 is our campus policy regulating the appointment of a very small*
17 *number of faculty who are appointed with annual salary supplements above*
18 *that of the CSU/CFA contract. There are at present only 2 such faculty at*
19 *SJSU. The number of these faculty are limited to 100 system wide, and the*
20 *size of their supplementary salary is currently limited to 5-35% of their*
21 *normal salary. The supplements are paid by non-state dollars, including*
22 *grants, gifts, or foundation resources, and are designed “to permit*
23 *campuses to appoint individuals of regional and national professional*
24 *stature.” These have become known as Grant-Related Instructional Faculty*
25 *(GRIF.)*

26
27 *This program is nearly 40 years old and is currently regulated by CSU*
28 *coded memorandum HR 2005-37. The coded memo requires that*
29 *campuses create their own procedures for the selection of GRIF faculty,*
30 *and F81-7 is our campus’s document to comply with this system*
31 *requirement.*

32
33 *Some of the parameters have changed since our campus policy was first*
34 *approved in 1981, such as the change from 25% to 35% for the maximum*
35 *supplementary salary. These amendments are designed to bring our policy*
36 *into compliance with the current coded memo, and to make it less likely that*
37 *it will need to be amended in the future as new coded memos are released.*
38 *We have, for example, removed the specific reference to the size of the*
39 *award since it has changed and since the procedures should apply even if it*
40 *were to change again.*

41
42 *In drafting these amendments, Professional Standards was loathe to*
43 *become too specific about the process for appointment or renewal given*
44 *that the policy concerns such a tiny number of cases. Instead, both the old*
45 *and the revised policy rely upon the relevant actors to develop procedures*
46 *as they go, within certain broad boundary lines. While faculty committees*
47 *must be involved in approval, the policy is deliberately silent about which*
48 *committees they will be—whether an existing personnel committee or a*
49 *specially appointed committee. The nitty gritty details are primarily left to*
50 *the Provost, as they are now.*

51
52
53
54 Approved: February 19, 2018

55 Vote: 9-0-0

56 Present: Chin, He, Marachi, Kauppila, McKee, White, Peter, Donahue,
57 Kimbarow

58 Absent: Pyeon, McKee

59 Financial Impact: None.

60 Workload Impact: None.

63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112

1. Definition and Minimum Qualifications for Grant-Related Instructional Faculty (GRIF)

1.1. As a result of action taken by the CSU Board of Trustees, instructional faculty members meeting specified criteria may be appointed with additional to two classes (10-month and 12-month); each provides for compensation from grants, individual gifts or bequests, or foundation allocations at a 5-25% differential above the salary for their regular rank and step. In addition to the education and experience normally required for the academic rank to which they are to be appointed, the criteria are that the candidates have exceptional professional merit in scholarship and teaching as evidenced by regional or national recognition.

1.2. CSU coded memo (HR 2005-37 at the time of this policy recommendation, or its successor memo if subsequently changed) FSA 75-55 further describes these classes appointments and should be referenced whenever making a GRIF appointment. The most important provisions of the coded memo include the following:

1.2.1. Each appointment is to be made ~~Each appointment to one or the other class is to be made, as appropriate,~~ for one academic year or 12 month period only, subject to additional appointments by the president after faculty consultation and within funding limits. ~~the limits of the grant support.~~

1.2.2. No tenure accrual or salary rights attach to a GRIF appointment ~~either class~~ separate from the tenure rights and salary normally accruing from regular full-time faculty appointment. Appointment to either class does not constitute a promotion; nor does termination of an appointment without renewal constitute a demotion.

1.3. Qualifications. Candidates recommended for GRIF designation should be of “regional or national professional stature” and should be of “exceptional merit.” Particular qualifications for positions shall be identified either by the fund grantor, subject to the approval of the appropriate department, college, or university committees and administrators, or by consultation among the appropriate committees and administrators.

2. Appointment Procedures.

2.1. GRIF faculty must first be appointed using university procedures for the recruitment and selection of faculty (S15-6 at the time of this policy recommendation or its successor policy.) No appointment may be made without the recommendation of the appropriate faculty committee(s) and administrator(s) in the unit to which the appointment is made, and without the approval of the Provost and the President.

2.2. Designation of a new or existing faculty position as a GRIF position shall be subject to the review of an appropriate faculty committee, with final approval from the Provost and the President.

113 2.3. Specific selection procedures. Procedures for selection of recipients of particular
114 grants shall be developed by a process of consultation between the fund grantor
115 and the relevant committees and administrators. Procedures will necessarily vary
116 because of differences in the nature and terms of funding arrangements, but
117 should include specific provisions relating to recruitment of candidates (whether
118 by national search; nomination by grantor, university faculty, university
119 administrators, etc.) and the final selection.

120
121 2.4. Renewal of a GRIF designation in subsequent years may be expedited according
122 to procedures determined by the Provost, but shall require annual review by an
123 appropriate faculty committee.

124 125 II. Appointment Procedures.

126
127 Appointment procedures for these classes shall be developed as follows:

128
129 ~~1. Particular qualifications for positions shall be identified either by the fund grantor,~~
130 ~~subject to the approval of the appropriate department, school, or university committees~~
131 ~~and administrators, or by consultation among the appropriate committees and~~
132 ~~administrators. Normally, department recruitment committees, school policy committees,~~
133 ~~department chairs, and school deans should be consulted, with final approval from the~~
134 ~~Academic Vice President and the President.~~

135
136 ~~2. Procedures for selection of recipients of particular grants shall be developed by a~~
137 ~~similar process of consultation. Procedures will necessarily vary because of differences~~
138 ~~in the nature and terms of funding arrangements, but should include specific provisions~~
139 ~~relating to recruitment of candidates (whether by national affirmative action search;~~
140 ~~nomination by grantor, university faculty, university administrators, etc.) and the final~~
141 ~~selection. Whenever possible, normal university procedures for the recruitment and~~
142 ~~selection of faculty should be used. No appointment may be made without the~~
143 ~~recommendation of the appropriate faculty committee(s) and administrator(s) in the unit~~
144 ~~to which the appointment is made, and without the approval of the Academic Vice~~
145 ~~President and the President.~~

1 **San Jose State University**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Instruction & Student Affairs**
4 **April 9, 2018**
5 **Final Reading**
6
7

AS 1686

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Policy Recommendation
Rescinds S66-11, College Reports to
Selective Service Boards

Whereas, The Selective Service System does not currently classify registrants, and

Whereas, The Selective Service System does not have criteria regarding a reporting mechanism or required information to be reported; therefore, be it

Resolved: That S66-11 be rescinded.

Rationale:

The current policy is out of date. Given the lack of guidance on the Selective Service System Website regarding a reporting mechanism or standards for classifying registrants, there is insufficient information available to replace S66-11 with a revised policy.

Approved: February 19, 2018

Vote: 12-0-0

Present: Busick, Gill, Grindstaff, Khan, Manzo, Nash, Ng, Sen, Simpson, Sullivan-Green, Trousdale, Walters, Wilson, Yao

Financial impact: None

Workload impact: None

1 SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
2 Academic Senate
3 Curriculum and Research Committee
4 April 9, 2018
5 First Reading
6

AS 1688

7
8 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
9 **Rescind F83-10 Entry- Level Mathematics (ELM) Examination;**
10 **Sanctions; Probation**

11 **Rationale:** Executive Order 1110, issued by the Chancellor on August 2, 2017,
12 discontinued, with immediate effect, the offering of the English Placement Test (EPT)
13 and the Entry- Level Mathematics (ELM) Test. SJSU Policy F83-10 stipulates that
14 students who are required to take the ELM test must do so during their first semester of
enrollment. This requirement conflicts with EO 1110.

15 **Whereas:** [Executive Order 1110](#) discontinued the offering of the English Placement
16 Test (EPT) and the Entry- Level Mathematics (ELM) Test effective August
17 2, 2017, and

18 **Whereas:** [F83-10](#) stipulates that students who are required to take the ELM test
19 must do so during their first semester of enrollment, therefore be it

20 **Resolved:** that F83-10 be rescinded.

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

Approved: March 5, 2018
Vote: 13-0-0
Present: Bacich, Buzanski, Cargill, Chung, Jensen, Heil, Matoush, Stacks,
Rodan, Trulio, Schultz-Krohn, Anagnos, De Guzman
Absent: None
Workload Impact: None
Financial Impact: None

1 SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
2 Academic Senate
3 Curriculum and Research Committee
4 April 9, 2018
5 First Reading
6
7

AS 1689

8 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
9 **Rescind S80-9 Resource Analysis Required for Curricular Proposals**

10
11 Legislative History: S80-9 outlined the specific forms to be used for curricular proposals
12 and directed new courses to use a specific proposal form.
13

14 Whereas: Curricular proposals are typically initiated at the department/school, and
15

16 Whereas: Budget and resources are handled at the college level, and
17

18 Whereas: The Office of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs provides information
19 regarding the required elements to be included in a course proposal, and
20

21 Whereas: S80-9 designated that specific forms be used for course proposals that
22 are no longer used in practice; therefore be it
23

24 Resolved: that S80-9 be rescinded.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Approved: 3-7-2018

41 Vote: 11-0-0

42 Present: Anagnos, Bacich, Cargill, Chung, De Guzman, Heil, Jensen,
43 Matoush, Rodan, Schultz-Krohn, Stacks

44 Absent: Buzanski, Trulio

45 Workload Impact: None anticipated

46 Financial Impact: None anticipated

6
7
8
9 **Policy Recommendation**
10 **Amendment A to S13-6 (Campus Awards)**
11 **To Provide for System Award Nominations**

12
13 **Resolved:** That S13-6 be amended as shown by the ~~strikeout~~ and underline of the
14 attached. (The referral and supporting documents are attached for
15 information but will not become part of policy.)

16
17 **Rationale:** Professional Standards received referral PS-F17-2, requesting that we
18 examine the procedures for determining the nominees for the CSU-wide
19 Wang Family Award and possibly codify them in policy. The Wang Family
20 Awards are the most prestigious awards in the CSU. They are described
21 in their current form in the attachment.

22
23 For many years the campus has determined our nominees for the Wang
24 awards in a somewhat *ad hoc* way. In fact, the process has been
25 reinvented from time to time as Senate Chairs and Presidents come and
26 go. For example, the Senate Office found a memo from Spring 2000
27 outlining a set of internal procedures, but this memo had been lost over
28 the years (see attachment.) Further complicating matters, the Wang
29 awards have changed several times—both their criteria, their categories,
30 timelines, etc. As a result, the nomination process has sometimes been
31 rushed. Professional Standards is committed to a policy that assures that
32 the President will receive the strongest possible pool of faculty nominees
33 each year.

34
35 Professional Standards confronted a common policy-making dilemma:
36 how can we provide for a rational process without creating language that
37 is so specific that it rapidly becomes inflexible or obsolete? We
38 responded in the following way:

- 39
- 40 • We have crafted flexible language that allows the President and the
41 Chair of the Senate to create committees and processes as
42 needed.
 - 43 • We kept mention of the Wang awards and all specifics about
44 timelines and categories out of the language, so that the same
45 flexible process could be used even if the awards change, or if new
system awards require nominations.

46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76

- We record this language in the campus awards policy, where it plausible fits and where it will not be misplaced.
- We harness, when possible, synchronicity between the campus awards process and recipients to assist the nominations for system awards or the construction of system award committees.

In addition to the amendments designed to address the need for system award nominations, Professional Standards recommends several minor editorial amendments designed to update the awards policy. For example, since 2013 we have adopted a new RTP policy and the term “academic assignment” is becoming less useful and well understood since we now have separate categories for teaching and service. This term was replaced in the Outstanding Professor section with “teaching and service to students.” Similarly, we have more prominently highlighted the requirement for tenure for several of the awards—they have always required tenure but this was buried in the fine print, leading to some confusion.

Approved: (March 5, 2018)

Vote: (10-0-0)

Present: (Chin, He, Marachi, Kauppila, McKee, White, Peter, Donahue, Pyeon, Kimbarow)

Absent: (none)

Financial Impact: None.

Workload Impact: There will be no more workload than currently exists, and having an agreed upon process may reduce workload by preventing the reinvention of the wheel on an annual basis.

77 ~~OUTSTANDING PROFESSOR, PRESIDENT'S SCHOLAR, DISTINGUISHED~~
78 ~~SERVICE, and OUTSTANDING LECTURER AWARDS~~
79 ~~CAMPUS FACULTY AWARDS~~
80 ~~AND NOMINATIONS FOR SYSTEM FACULTY AWARDS~~
81

82 **I. Purpose**
83

84 The purpose of the Outstanding Professor, President's Scholar, Distinguished
85 Service Award, and the Outstanding Lecturer Awards is to recognize faculty
86 members who have excelled in the areas of teaching and advising, scholarship
87 or creative activity, service to the university or profession, and a lecturer's
88 excellence in teaching effectiveness and service, respectively. The recipients of
89 these awards are those individuals who have continued exceptional performance
90 in these areas.
91

92 This policy provides the eligibility for the four faculty awards, the nomination and
93 selection processes and the criteria for each award.
94

95 This policy also provides a process for nominating faculty from SJSU for system
96 based awards.
97

98 **II. Information Relevant for All Four Campus Awards**
99

100 **A. Eligibility**
101

- 102 1. To be eligible for any of the four faculty awards, an individual must:
103
104 a. Be a Unit 3 faculty member; and
105
106 b. Not be part of the Management Personnel Plan (MPP status) either
107 when nominated or selected; and
108
109 c. Not be retired (although retirement during the academic year does
110 not forfeit eligibility for that year). A previously tenured faculty who
111 has relinquished tenure to participate in an early retirement
112 program (e.g. FERP) will be eligible during the first year of the
113 retirement program. He or she will be regarded for this policy as
114 retaining the academic rank held prior to the early retirement; and
115
116 d. Not have been awarded the particular award previously.
117
118 2. Additional requirements for particular awards:
119 a. For the President's Scholar award, nominees must have attained
120 the rank of Professor.

- 121 b. For the Outstanding Lecturer Award, a lecturer must have been at
122 SJSU for at least six semesters.
123 c. For the President's Scholar award, the Outstanding Professor
124 Award, and the Distinguished Service award, nominees must have
125 earned tenure at San Jose State University.
126

127 B. Nomination Process

- 128
129 1. A Calendar organizing the deadlines for campus awards ~~all parts of the~~
130 ~~process~~ shall be created by mutual consent of the President and the
131 Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. This Calendar will be
132 distributed with the annual announcement and instructions for
133 nominations. If the President and Executive Committee do not act, the
134 default dates will be as follows:
135 a. Awards and calendar to be announced and publicized no later
136 than October 1.
137 b. Nominations are due by October 31 (if that date falls on the
138 weekend, then the due date will be the following Monday).
139 c. Selection committees will be formed no later than October 31.
140 d. Committee recommendations shall be delivered to the President
141 no later than March 1.
142 e. The President will announce the awards no later than April 1.
143
144 2. The Senate Office and President's Office will work together to
145 coordinate the sending of a notice to the entire campus community
146 soliciting nominations for each of the four awards. A single
147 announcement will be used for all four awards. That announcement
148 will include the above eligibility factors, and refer people to this policy
149 for a description of each award (with the web location provided in the
150 letter). A single nomination form (see the Appendix of this policy) will
151 be used for each award and be attached to the memo distributed to the
152 campus community. Nominations are to be accompanied by an up-to-
153 1500-word letter stating the reasons for nominating the faculty member
154 and describing the accomplishments of the nominee as appropriate to
155 the award criteria.
156
157 3. Nominations may come from any source including self-nominations.
158 Deans should publicize the awards within their colleges and encourage
159 nominations for all four awards from all sources.
160
161 4. It shall be the responsibility of the Administrative Chair of each
162 committee to arrange for unsuccessful nominations and their
163 supporting materials to be retained for three years. Nominations will
164 remain active for consideration for three years, with nominees given

165 the option of submitting additional or revised materials with each
166 annual cycle. After three years the nominee's materials will be
167 discarded and a new set of materials would be required if the
168 candidate is nominated again.

169
170
171 C. Selection Process

- 172
173 1. Separate selection committees will be formed annually for each award.
174 The members of each selection committee are described at Sections
175 III, IV, and V and VI of this policy. The Executive Committee of the
176 Senate will work with the President in forming each of the four ~~three~~
177 committees. In this selection process, effort should be made to ensure
178 that at least one member also served on the selection committee in the
179 prior year in order to provide continuity for the committees. In addition,
180 the Executive Committee and the President should strive for broad
181 representation of the colleges.
182
- 183 2. Each selection committee will review the nominations to select the
184 nominees for whom further information is desired. The selection
185 committee will determine the type of information needed to make its
186 selection, but such information at a minimum will include the nominee's
187 curriculum vitae and self-verification of their eligibility (as described in
188 section II.A. of this policy). The selection committees will set their own
189 process and schedule for receiving and reviewing information, but
190 must forward their recommendations to the President by the date
191 established by the annual awards calendar.
192
- 193 3. General guidelines for the selection committees are provided in
194 Section VII of this policy.

195
196 D. Role of the Academic Senate and the President

- 197
198 1. The Academic Senate Office and the President's Office will work
199 together in notifying the campus community of the request for
200 nominations. The Senate Office will receive the nominations and
201 ensure that they are delivered to the chairs of each selection
202 committee. The Senate Office will also assist each committee in
203 corresponding with nominees.
204
- 205 2. The Senate Executive Committee will work with the President to select
206 the members of each selection committee as described in Sections III,
207 IV, and V of this policy.
208

- 209 3. The President will select the recipient of each award from a list of three
210 unranked faculty selected by the selection committees.
211
212 4. The President's Office is responsible for notifying the award recipients,
213 and for funding and arranging for the issuance of the awards.
214
215 5. Confidentiality of all information will be maintained at all times.
216

217 E. Form of Award

218
219 At a minimum, each award recipient will receive a plaque, a monetary
220 award, and recognition at graduation and another event selected by the
221 President in consultation with the Senate Executive Committee.
222

223 **III. Outstanding Professor Award**

224
225 A. Purpose of the Award

226
227 To recognize a tenured faculty member for overall excellence in teaching
228 and service to students. ~~academic assignment.~~
229

230 B. Criteria

231
232 In evaluating candidates for this award, consideration should be given to
233 the criteria listed below. There is no set-weighting requirement, but it is
234 highly recommended that the recipient have accomplishments in each of
235 the broad criteria categories set out below.
236

237 1. Teaching Excellence

- 238
239 a. Evidence of teaching excellence exists as demonstrated
240 through SOTE scores, other student evaluations, peer
241 evaluations, external reviews, etc.
242
243 b. Teaches a variety of courses.
244
245 c. Participates in professional and scholarly activities that
246 enhance teaching ability and currency in the discipline.
247
248 d. Serves as a mentor to other educational professionals.
249

250 2. Commitment to Students
251

- 252 a. Advises students through student organizations, theses, and/or
253 other projects.
254
255 b. Participates in student orientation and advisement activities.
256
257 c. Mentors students regarding career and graduate school
258 considerations.
259
260 d. Engages in service to the campus and/or profession that
261 benefits students.
262

263 C. Selection Committee

264
265 The Selection Committee shall consist of three prior recipients of the
266 award, one student, and one administrator. All shall be voting members of
267 the committee. The administrator shall serve as chair of the committee.
268

269 **IV. President's Scholar Award**

270
271 A. Purpose of the Award
272

273 To recognize a faculty member who has achieved widespread recognition
274 based on the quality of scholarship, performances, or creative activities.
275

276 B. Criteria
277

278 In evaluating candidates for this award, consideration should be given to
279 the nominee's history of scholarship and creative activities, recognition of
280 outstanding achievements by peers, and importance of the work to the
281 discipline and beyond. These criteria may only be changed with
282 consultation and approval of the President.
283

284 C. Selection Committee
285

286 The Selection Committee shall consist of four prior recipients of the award
287 and one administrator. All shall be voting members of the committee. The
288 administrator shall serve as chair of the committee.
289

290 **V. Distinguished Service Award**

291 A. Purpose of the Award
292
293

294 To recognize a tenured faculty member for exemplary service in a
295 leadership capacity to the University and/or the community or profession,
296 that brings credit to San José State University.

297
298 B. Criteria

299
300 In evaluating candidates for this award, consideration should be given to
301 the criteria listed below. There is no set-weighting requirement, but it is
302 highly recommended that the recipient have accomplishments in all three
303 broad criteria categories set out below.

304
305 In addition to the criteria described below, eligibility for this award requires
306 that the faculty member have a consistent record of service at the
307 department, college, and/or university levels.

308
309 1. Contribution to the SJSU Mission

310
311 a. The faculty member's contribution falls within one or more types of
312 service to the campus. Examples of service include, but are not
313 limited to, contributions through committee work; student outreach
314 and retention; application of expertise to benefit the University and
315 its community through participation in university and community
316 organizations, professional associations, Academic Senate and
317 other governance bodies, California Faculty Association, and
318 appropriate governmental boards and commissions; advancement
319 of public support for the University; and lectures and seminars to
320 community groups.

321
322 b. The faculty member's service provides a meaningful benefit to the
323 campus.

324
325 c. The faculty member is able to involve members of the SJSU
326 community in the service activity.

327
328 2. Significant Contribution

329
330 a. The faculty member's service has a significant effect on the
331 campus, professional or broader communities.

332
333 b. The faculty member's service demonstrates leadership and
334 initiative.

335
336 3. On-Going Commitment

337

- 338 a. The faculty member has made a consistent contribution of service.
339
340 b. The faculty member's service record represents multiple years of
341 commitment.

342
343 C. Selection Committee

344
345 The Selection Committee shall consist of three prior recipients of the
346 award, an administrator and a member of the community. All shall be
347 voting members of the committee. The administrator shall serve as chair
348 of the committee.

349
350 **VI. Outstanding Lecturer Award**

351
352 A. Purpose

353
354 To recognize a lecturer for excellence in teaching effectiveness and
355 service to the San José State University campus community.

356
357 B. Criteria

358
359 In evaluating candidates for this award, consideration should be given to
360 the guidelines listed below. The recipient must demonstrate excellence in
361 facilitating student learning (category 1), and should also demonstrate
362 significant contributions in one or both of the remaining categories
363 (categories 2 and 3.)

364 1. Excellence in Facilitating Student Learning – which might be
365 evidenced by:

- 366 a. SOTE scores, other student evaluations, peer evaluations, external
367 reviews, etc.
368 b. Teaching or providing assistance for a variety of courses.
369 c. Teaching a course designed by them at the request of their
370 department or college.
371 d. Playing a key role in the design of: curriculum, tutorials, learning
372 objectives, assessment procedures, lab set up or operations, or a
373 departmental, college or university project or initiative

374 e. Serving as a mentor to other educational professionals.

375 2. Commitment to Students – which might be evidenced by:

- 376 a. Advising students through student organizations and/or other
377 projects.
- 378 b. Participating in student orientation and advisement activities.
- 379 c. Mentoring students regarding career and graduate school
380 considerations.
- 381 d. Engaging in service to the campus and/or profession that benefits
382 students.
- 383 3. Contributions Beyond Teaching – which might be evidenced by
384 consistency of:
- 385 a. Service on university, college and/or department committees or
386 projects that provide a meaningful benefit to the campus.
- 387 b. Service to the campus or profession that demonstrates leadership
388 and initiative.
- 389 c. High quality scholarship, performances, or creative activities.

390 C. Selection Committee

391 The Selection Committee shall consist of three prior recipients of the
392 award, one student, and one administrator. All shall be voting members of
393 the committee. The administrator shall serve as chair of the committee.
394

395 **VII. General Guidelines for Selection Committees**

396 A. General Guidance

397 The selection committees have latitude in many aspects of their operation,
398 from setting their meeting schedule to the approach for evaluating
399 nominees within the criteria set out in this policy.
400
401

402 B. Reminders for each Selection Committee:

- 403 1. Establish a schedule that will allow sufficient time for nominations to be
404 reviewed, eligibility verified, determination by the committee of the type
405 of documentation to be prepared by nominees, nominees' preparation
406 of the required documentation, and review of the nominee materials.
407 The committee needs to forward the names of the top three nominees
408
409

410 (unranked) to the President by the date established by the President in
411 conjunction with each committee chair but no later than March 1.

- 412
- 413 2. The Office of Faculty Affairs can assist the committee if it needs to
414 verify the eligibility of any nominee.
- 415
- 416 3. If the committee determines that the number of nominees is greater
417 than the number who should be asked for further documentation, a
418 "first cut" should be made based on the nominating letters. If the
419 committee determines that an insufficient number of nominations have
420 been made, it should consult with the Chair of the Senate about
421 sending out another request for nominations.
- 422
- 423 4. Decide what additional documentation should be requested from
424 nominees, such as letters of recommendation or a personal statement.
425 At a minimum, nominees are to submit a curriculum vitae. A discussion
426 of the purpose of the award and the criteria (as set out in this policy)
427 should help the committee in deciding upon the documentation to
428 request.
- 429
- 430 5. Decide upon an approach for reviewing the nomination letters and the
431 information provided by nominees, and for selecting the top three
432 nominees.
- 433
- 434 6. After the top three nominees have been selected, a summary of the
435 significant qualifications of each should be forwarded to the President's
436 Office along with the nominating letters and information provided by
437 each of the three nominees. The three nominees submitted to the
438 President should be unranked. If the committee determines there are
439 fewer than three qualified candidates, then fewer than three nominees
440 should be forwarded. If the committee determines that there is no
441 qualified candidate, then no names should be forwarded and the award
442 not given in that year.
- 443
- 444 7. The committee chair should arrange for mailing of letters to nominees
445 to request additional information, as well as thank you letters upon
446 completion of the process. The President's Office will also send a
447 congratulatory letter to the recipient of the award, and optionally, to the
448 other two finalists.
- 449
- 450 8. Committee members are to maintain confidentiality of the nominee
451 names, documentation, and evaluation comments.
- 452

453 **VIII. System Awards.**

454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494

- A. Purpose. From time to time the CSU requests faculty nominees for various system-wide awards (e.g., the Wang awards.) Sometimes these requests arrive with short timelines. This section (VIII) of policy is intended to provide a means for SJSU to nominate faculty candidates of excellence for system awards while retaining the flexibility to adapt to new awards, sudden timelines, or changes in criteria.

- B. Announcement. When nominations of faculty for a system wide award are requested, the Chair of the Senate or the President shall announce the award and procedures for application to the campus in a timely manner.

- C. Committee(s). The Chair of the Senate shall organize one or more special screening committees (as needed) to provide the President with nominations. The committee or committees shall parallel the general structure of campus awards committees and each shall
 - i. be chaired by an administrator appointed by the President;
 - ii. be joined by three prior recipients of campus or system based awards, with the provision that no committee members may be candidates for the current award;
 - iii. the members should, so far as is possible be selected for their expertise or achievements in the area(s) covered by the system award.

- D. The nominating committee will consider any applications or nominations that emerge from an open call. In addition, when criteria for a system award parallel those of an internal SJSU award, the committee shall review among the pool of potential nominees the last three SJSU awardees in the similar category.

- E. The Committee is encouraged to follow the standard procedures for the other campus awards as much as possible within the limits of the particular system-wide award, and should provide the President with three unranked choices from among the candidates, along with a summary of their qualifications.

495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537

Appendix

Nomination Form for Outstanding Professor, President’s Scholar, Distinguished Service Award, and Outstanding Lecturer Award

Instructions:

- Before completing this form, please read the eligibility criteria for each award outlined in UP S00-9 available at http://www.sjsu.edu/senate/policies/pol_chron/index.
- Please use a separate form for each nominee.
- In addition to submitting this nomination form, you must also submit (at the same time) an up-to-1500-word letter stating the reasons for nominating the faculty member and describing the accomplishments of the nominee as appropriate to the award criteria.
- Submit this nomination form, with your letter attached, to the Academic Senate Office (ADM 176 or zip 0024) by October 31.

To: Academic Senate Office (ADM 176) 0024

From: _____ Phone: _____

Subject: Nominations for Faculty Award

I would like to nominate the following tenured faculty member for (check only one):

Outstanding Professor Award

President’s Scholar Award

Distinguished Service Award

Outstanding Lecturer Award

NOMINEE’S NAME: _____

NOMINEE’S DEPARTMENT: _____

1 SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
2 Academic Senate
3 Curriculum and Research Committee
4 April 9, 2018
5 First Reading
6
7

AS 1691

8 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
9 **Rescind University Policy S09-5 - Priority Registration**

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

Legislative History: S97-1 set the order for priority registration. S97-1 was amended by S09-5. S97-1 has been rescinded and the order for priority registration is now addressed in F17-4.

Whereas: S09-5 amended S97-1, and

Whereas: S97-1 set the order for priority registration, and

Whereas: the order for priority registration is now defined in F17-4, therefore be it

Resolved: that S09-5 be rescinded.

Approved: 4-2-2018

Vote: 13-0-0

Present: Anagnos, Bacich, Buzanski, Cargill, Chung, De Guzman, Heil, Jensen, Matoush, Rodan, Schultz-Krohn, Stacks, Trulio

Absent: None

Workload Impact: None anticipated

Financial Impact: None anticipated

1 San José State University
2 Academic Senate
3 University Library Board
4 April 9, 2018
5 First Reading

AS 1692

6
7 **Sense of the Senate Resolution**

8 **To Support Open Access Publishing and Promote the Retention of Author Rights**
9 **Among SJSU Faculty**

10

11 Whereas: Open access publishing and archiving is a critical component to the long-
12 term viability and sustainability of scholarly discourse^{1,2}; and

13 Whereas: Freely accessible scholarship benefits the academy and society at
14 large^{3,4}; and

15 Whereas: Open access increases networking among scholars⁵ with the likelihood
16 that SJSU scholarship is more easily discoverable and used by others;
17 and

18 Whereas: Open access increases the visibility of scholars' research⁶ and thus
19 enhances the University's reputation; and

20 Whereas: Open access attempts to offset the sharply rising journal and database
21 costs incurred by libraries⁷; and

22 Whereas: Open access enhances the broad dissemination of scholarly work and is
23 consistent with federal agency requirements for public access findings⁸;
24 and

¹ Houghton, J. W., & Oppenheim, C. (2010). The economic implications of alternative publishing models. *Prometheus*, 28(1), 41-54.

² Houghton, J. W. (2013). Economic implications of alternative scholarly publishing models. In *A Handbook of Digital Library Economics* (pp. 125-141).

³ Chan, L., & Costa, S. (2005). Participation in the global knowledge commons: challenges and opportunities for research dissemination in developing countries. *New library world*, 106(3/4), 141-163.

⁴ Willinsky, J. (2006). *The access principle: The case for open access to research and scholarship*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

⁵ Wang, X., Liu, C., Mao, W., & Fang, Z. (2015). The open access advantage considering citation, article usage and social media attention. *Scientometrics*, 103(2), 555-564.

⁶ Miguel, S., Chinchilla-Rodríguez, Z., & de Moya-Anegón, F. (2011). Open access and Scopus: A new approach to scientific visibility from the standpoint of access. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 62(6), 1130-1145.

⁷ Van Noorden, R. (2013). The true cost of science publishing. *Nature*, 495(7442), 426-429.

⁸<https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/blog/2013/02/22/expanding-public-access-results-federally-funded-research>

25 Whereas: Open access contributes to global information sharing, including
26 developing countries that do not have access to expensive databases or
27 journal subscriptions⁹; and
28 Whereas: Open access increases author flexibility to manage works after publication
29 via increased retention of author rights¹⁰; and
30
31 Whereas: SJSU Library staff already facilitate deposit of faculty publications in SJSU
32 ScholarWorks¹¹, the SJSU digital repository, with minimal time investment
33 by faculty; therefore so be it
34
35 Resolved: That the Academic Senate of SJSU encourages SJSU faculty to continue
36 seeking high quality and rigorous peer-reviewed journals to publish their
37 scholarly work that are broadly recognized by scholarly communities as
38 suitable to meet the standards of promotion and tenure, and be it
39
40 Resolved: That retention, tenure, and promotion committees consider faculty work
41 published in open access and controlled access venues as equivalent,
42 while using discipline-specific criteria to evaluate quality, value, and
43 impact; and be it
44
45 Resolved: That SJSU faculty become aware of current open access options:
46 a. Green Access - Journals that allow for self-archiving of pre- or post-
47 prints in repositories¹²
48 b. Gold - Journals that are fully open access¹³
49 c. Hybrid - Journals that contain a mix of traditional subscription articles
50 alongside open access articles, and be it
51
52 Resolved: That SJSU faculty seek to retain as many rights as they can during the
53 publishing process to ensure greater control over the potential for
54 academic and public access to the research (see [SPARC Author](#)
55 [Addendum](#)), including retaining rights to deposit pre- or post-prints into
56 ScholarWorks, the campus institutional repository, and be it
57

⁹ Chan, L., Kirsop, B., & Arunachalam, S. (2005). Open access archiving: the fast track to building research capacity in developing countries.

¹⁰ <https://sparcopen.org/our-work/author-rights/>

¹¹ <http://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/>

¹² <http://www.sherpa.ac.uk/romeo/browse.php?colour=green&fIDnum=|&mode=simple&la=en&letter=all>

¹³ <https://doaj.org/>

58 Resolved: That the Academic Senate of SJSU encourages the Chancellor's Office to
59 consider a [University of California \(UC\)-style Open Access policy](#) that
60 ensures equitable and open access dissemination of faculty scholarship.
61

62
63
64
65

66 Approved: Monday, April 2, 2018
67 Vote: 7-0-0
68 Present: Bodart, Gaylle, Khavul, Sasikumar, Smith, Taylor, Tian, Elliott (non-
69 voting)
70 Absent: Megwalu, Borchard, Villena, Villanueva, Kim, Cabrera, Lee
71 Financial Impact: None
72 Workload Impact: None

1 San José State University
2 Academic Senate
3 Organization and Government Committee
4 April 9, 2018
5 First Reading
6

AS 1693

7
8 **Policy Recommendation**
9 **Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Committee**

10 Legislative History: This proposal would supersede previous policies related to the
11 current special agency: Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention (ADAP) Committee. The
12 originating policy related to this committee (S89-9, Substance Abuse Committee) was
13 amended by S92-11 (Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Committee) and
14 subsequently rescinded by S96-12 (Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Committee).
15 S01-2 (Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Committee) rescinded S96-12 and was
16 modified by F01-1 (Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Committee Composition).
17

18 Whereas: The Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Committee has proposed
19 changes to its charge and membership, and
20

21 Whereas: SJSU's attention to issues surrounding health and wellness
22 highlights the importance of providing the campus with a resource
23 that can support and facilitate efforts to provide education and
24 support services in the areas of alcohol and substance abuse, and
25

26 Whereas: A special agency is particularly well suited to service that brings
27 together knowledgeable individuals who can inform the work of the
28 committee as well as convey information to their respective
29 programs, and
30

31 Whereas: Members with expertise and direct engagement with campus
32 programs and initiatives in the areas of alcohol and substance
33 abuse are needed for effective outreach and communication,
34 therefore be it
35

36 Resolved: That S01-2 and F01-1 be rescinded and replaced by the following
37 proposal regarding the charge and membership of a special agency
38 called the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Committee.
39
40

41 Rationale: The interest from the current ADAP committee in taking on a more active
42 and engaged role is welcome and should be supported. The reflection and subsequent
43 proposal are what O&G hoped to nurture with its call to all committee chairs to review
44 their charge and membership this semester. One of the keys to the group's ability to

45 achieve the work outlined in its charge is to have members include those directly
46 involved in health/wellness programs, initiatives, education, and services.

47

48

49

50 Approved: 4/2/18

51 Vote: 8-0-0

52 Present: Bailey, French, Grosvenor, Hart, Norman, Ormsbee,
53 Higgins, Shifflett

54 Absent: Curry, Rajkovic, Ramasubramanian

55 Financial Impact: None

56 Workload Impact: None

57

58

59

60

61

Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Committee

62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101

The Alcohol and Substance Abuse Prevention Committee (ADAP) will be a special agency able to assist with identifying challenges, serve as an advisory resource to the campus community, and communicate information across the campus related to alcohol and substance abuse prevention and intervention activities, programs, and policies. In addition, this committee will serve as a resource to enhance the campus community’s understanding of issues pertaining to alcohol and substance abuse; develop a broad and deep understanding of these issues at all levels in order to identify and analyze problem areas and propose solutions; and provide advice to the President and campus programs as needed.

1. Charge

ADAP serves as a campus resource and advisory group to the University President. The committee will help in facilitating educational awareness and communication on the topics of alcohol and substance abuse, intervention and prevention through various engagement and outreach activities and events for the SJSU campus and community at large.

ADAP will identify and assist in promoting current and relevant university policies, Presidential Directives, best practices, and research-informed practices in its committee, coordination, and collaboration efforts.

ADAP will collaborate with various departments and divisions at SJSU and greater community to utilize the expertise available around the topics of alcohol and substance abuse, intervention and prevention.

2. Membership

- Director, Wellness and Health Promotion (EXO)
- Director, Student Conduct & Ethical Development (EXO)
- Director, Counseling & Psychological Services (EXO)
- Chief of Police or Designee (EXO)
- Residential Life Coordinator (selected by Director, University Housing) (EXO)
- Student Involvement; Student Engagement Coordinator NPHC, USFC (EXO)
- Senior Associate AD for Academics and Student Services/SWA (EXO)
- 2 Faculty-at-large (1 preferably from a health-related discipline)
- 1 Staff-at-large (non MPP)
- AS Director of programming affairs (EXO)

102 RA Student Representative
103 Greek Life Student Representative
104 Student from Peer Health Education Program
105

106
107 2.1 Recruitment and Appointment of Members
108

109 Members (other than ex-officio) serve a 3-year term which is renewable for one
110 additional 3-year term. When filling initial appointments, the Associate Vice Chair of
111 the Senate will stagger the terms of non ex-officio seats. Student members serve a 1-
112 year term and can be re-appointed. Solicitation of applications to serve on the Alcohol
113 and Drug Abuse Prevention Committee (ADAP) will be made through the normal
114 Committee on Committees process for the seats designated for faculty, staff, and
115 student members and will include a brief statement from each applicant regarding their
116 interest and experience in the areas of ADAP's work. When multiple applications are
117 submitted for a seat, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate will select
118 individuals to serve. In considering applicants, attention should focus on the person's
119 expertise/experience in areas related to the committee's work.
120

121 The co-chairs (1 faculty; 1 administrator) shall be appointed by the President in
122 consultation with the Senate's executive committee.
123

124 2.2 Interim Appointments.
125

126 When a seat will be vacant for no more than 1 semester (e.g., sabbatical/leave) an
127 interim appointment can be made following normal Committee on Committee
128 processes. Any seat that will be vacant for a year or more will require a replacement for
129 the remainder of the term associated with that seat.
130

131 2.3 Replacing Members
132

133 If a member is absent from three regularly scheduled committee meetings in an
134 academic year, the ADAP committee co-chairs may request that the Associate Vice
135 Chair of the Senate initiate action to recruit a replacement. If a member repeatedly
136 does not perform assigned committee duties, the co-chairs of the may request that the
137 Associate Vice Chair of the Senate initiate action to recruit a replacement.
138

139 3. Policy Modifications
140

141 Following implementation, if modifications to this policy appear needed, the ADAP
142 committee co-chairs will provide the Academic Senate Chair with the committee's
143 suggestions. The Chair of the Academic Senate will then refer the recommendation(s)
144 out to the appropriate policy committee for timely review and subsequent action.
145

1 SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
2 Academic Senate
3 Curriculum and Research Committee
4 April 9, 2018
5 First Reading
6

AS 1694

7
8 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
9 **Amendment A to University Policy S14-10**
10 **Master’s Committee Structure and Processes**
11 **and Thesis Embargoes**

12 Whereas: S14-10 does not allow MPP to serve as committee chairs for master’s
13 theses or doctoral dissertations; therefore be it

14 Resolved: S14-10 be amended to include the statement below in IB:

15 Title: **University Policy: Master/Doctoral Committee Structure and Processes and**
16 **Master Thesis/Doctoral Dissertation Embargoes**

17
18 **I. Thesis (Plan A) Committee Composition**

- 19 A. A master’s thesis committee will be composed of between three and five
20 members. Exceptions can be made only with the approval of Office of
21 Graduate and Undergraduate Programs.
- 22 B. The chairperson of the thesis committee must hold a permanent (tenured or
23 tenure track) San José State University faculty appointment. Emeritus and
24 FERPing (those in the Faculty Early Retirement Program) San José State
25 University faculty **or a MPP with retreat rights to the department**
26 **offering the degree** may serve as a committee chair with the consent of
27 the department chair or school director that offers the degree.
- 28 C. Qualified individuals, including part-time temporary faculty and non-faculty
29 with expertise related to the thesis topic, may serve as thesis committee
30 members.
- 31 D. At least half of the thesis committee must hold a San José State University
32 faculty appointment.
- 33 E. The department will determine the qualifications of those serving on the thesis
34 committee in terms of degree required and area expertise. If there are
35 contentions on the qualifications that cannot be resolved within the
36 department, the decision will be made by the college dean or designee.

37
38 Approved: April 2, 2018

39
40 Vote: 12-0-1
41

42 Present: Anagnos, Bacich, Buzanski, Cargill, Chung, De Guzman, Heil,
43 Jensen, Matoush, Rodan, Schultz-Krohn, Stacks, Trulio
44
45 Absent: None
46
47 Workload Impact: Increase workload for MPP serving as Committee Chair for a
48 Thesis/Dissertation
49
50 Financial Impact: None anticipated

1 SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
2 Academic Senate
3 Curriculum and Research Committee
4 April 9, 2018
5 First Reading
6
7

AS 1695

8 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
9 **Amendment A to F88-9**
10 **BA/BS Differentiation and Definition**
11

12
13 Legislative History: F88-9 defines the total number of units required for the Bachelor of
14 Arts and the Bachelor of Science degrees as 124 and 132 respectively. Title 5 Section
15 40508 states the BA/BS degrees require no fewer and no more than 120 semester
16 units.

17
18 Whereas: F88-9 defines the Bachelor of Arts (BA) degree as requiring a total of 124
19 semester units, and
20

21 Whereas: F88-9 defines the Bachelor of Science (BS) degree as requiring a total of
22 132 semester units, and
23

24 Whereas: a revision to the California Code of Regulations Title 5 Sections 40508,
25 40500 and 40501 mandate that as of AY 2014-15 both BA and BS
26 degrees require no fewer and no more than 120 semester units, therefore
27 be it
28

29 Resolved: That while Title 5 Sections 40508, 40500, and 40501 remain in force, F88-
30 9 be amended as follows:

31 Bachelor of Arts

32 The degree designation Bachelor of Arts is reserved for undergraduate programs
33 primarily intended to provide the student with a balanced liberal arts education, with
34 general knowledge in a recognized discipline or interdisciplinary field of study, and with
35 such fundamental intellectual capacities as reason and judgment. The degree is
36 characterized by breadth (i.e., opportunities for electives outside the major) and
37 flexibility. The Bachelor of Arts must consist of ~~at least 124~~ **no fewer and no more than**
38 **120** units, 40 of which must be upper division; the major requires a minimum of 24 units,
39 12 of which must be upper division.
40
41
42

43 Bachelor of Science

44 The degree designation Bachelor of Science is reserved for undergraduate programs
45 which provide the same general knowledge and intellectual capacities as the Bachelor
46 of Arts degree and which, in addition, provide scientific, technical, or professional
47 competence. The Bachelor of Science ~~may~~ **must** consist of ~~up to 132~~ **no fewer and no**
48 **more than 120** units, 40 units of which must be upper division; the major requires a
49 minimum of 36 units, 18 of which must be upper division.

50

51 Rationale: F88-9 defines two undergraduate degree designations, the Bachelor of Arts
52 and the Bachelor of Science. The unit totals defined in F88-9 required for each degree,
53 124 semester units for the BA degree and 132 semester units for the BS degree, are no
54 longer consistent with revisions to Title 5 ([§ 40508. The Bachelor's Degree: Total Units](#))
55 which limit both BA degrees ([§ 40500. Bachelor of Arts Degree: Required Curriculum](#))
56 and BS degrees ([§ 40501. Bachelor of Science Degree: Required Curriculum](#)) to 120
57 semester units.

58

59 Approved: 4-4-2018

60

61 Vote: 12-0-0

62

63 Present: Anagnos, Bacich, Buzanski, Cargill, Chung, Heil, Jensen, Matoush,
64 Rodan, Schultz-Krohn, Stacks, Trulio

65

66 Absent: De Guzman

67

68 Workload Impact: None anticipated

69

70 Financial Impact: None anticipated

1 **SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Instruction and Student Affairs Committee**
4 **April 9, 2018**
5 **First Reading**
6
7

AS 1696

8 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
9 **Amendment A to University Policy S17-13**
10 **Undergraduate Student Honors at San José State University**
11

12 Whereas, S17-13, Section 2.7.1 includes procedural directives; and

13
14 Whereas, policies should allow for those responsible to establish their own
15 procedures for enacting policies; therefore be it
16

17 Resolved that S17-13, Section 2.7.1., be amended to say:

18
19 **2.7.1** All honor roll awards, whether earned for the previous Fall or for the
20 previous Spring, will be recognized by the Office of the Provost.

21
22 Approved: April 2, 2018

23 Vote: 13-0-0

24 Present: Sullivan-Green, Nash, Simpson, Sen, Khan, Kim, Wilson, Manzo,
25 Ng (Non-voting), Grindstaff (Non-Voting), Walters, Trousdale,
26 Bullen, Busick, Hospidales.

27 Financial impact: Unknown

28 Workload impact: Unknown
29
30
31
32