SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE

2017/2018

Agenda

April 30, 2018, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm

Engineering 285/287

I. Call to Order and Roll Call –

II. Approval of Minutes:

Senate Minutes of April 9, 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 April 2, 2018

B. Consent Calendar –

C. Executive Committee Action Items –

V. Unfinished Business: None

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

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

AS 1690, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to S13-6 (Campus Awards) To Provide for System Award Nominations (Final Reading)

AS 1699, Policy Recommendation, Amendment G to S15-7 (RTP Procedures) Clarifying the period of review for Periodic "Annual" Reviews for Probationary Faculty (Final Reading)

B. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
AS 1697, Senate Management Resolution, Rescind SM-S95-2 (Standing Rule 6 Amendment) (Final Reading)

AS 1698, Policy Recommendation, Rescind F97-4 (Educational Equity Advisory Board) (Final Reading)

C. University Library Board (ULB):

D. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
AS 1676, Policy Recommendation, Department or School Name Change (Final Reading)

AS 1701, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy S89-2, Graduate Credit for Undergraduates (First Reading)

AS 1702, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds S67-31, Standards for Awarding Academic Credit: Faculty Appointment at SJSU; Discipline Specific Expertise of Faculty; Catalog Publication of Course (First Reading)

E. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
AS 1696, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to S17-13, Undergraduate Student Honors at SJSU (Final Reading)

AS 1700, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy F08-2, Repetition of Courses; Academic Renewal (First Reading)

VII. State of the University Announcements:

A. Statewide Academic Senators 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)

VIII. Special Committee Reports:

Report on Exceptional Admissions by Interim VP for Student Affairs, Sharon Willey, Director of UG and Grad. Outreach, Deanna Gonzales, and Interim Associate VP for Enrollment Services, Coleeta McElroy. Time Certain: 3:30 p.m.

IX. New Business:

X. Adjournment:

2017/2018 Academic Senate

MINUTES
April 9, 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

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

Deans:
Present: Elliott, Stacks, Jacobs
Absent: Ehrman

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

Alumni Representative:
Present: Walters

Emeritus Representative:
Present: Buzanski

Honorary Representative:
Present: Lessow-Hurley

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

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

COB Representatives:
Present: Bullen, He, Jensen
Absent: None

EDUC Representatives:
Present: Marachi, Mathur
Absent: None

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

H&A Representatives:
Present: Khan, Riley, McKee, Bacich
Absent: Ormsbee

SCI Representatives:
Present: Cargill, French, Kim
Absent: White

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

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–
The minutes of March 12, 2018 were approved as amended.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:
The President is in Washington D.C. and will not be here today.

B. From the President of the University – No report.

IV. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

Executive Committee Minutes of March 5, 2018 – No questions.

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

B. Consent Calendar:

The consent calendar of April 9, 2018 was approved. AVC Riley noted that the Committee on Committees is in the process of staffing the Writing Requirements Committee, an administrative committee reporting to the Board of General Studies (BOGS).

AVC Riley announced the results of the Senate General Elections as follows:
From CASA, Senator B.J. Grosvenor was re-elected.
From the COB, Senators Steven (Daoping) He and Maria Bullen were re-elected along with a new Senator, Susanna Khavul.
From the College of Education, Senator Roxana Marachi was re-elected.
From the College of Engineering, there is a new Senator elected, Anand Ramasubramanian. There is also one vacant seat remaining in the College of Engineering.
From the General Unit, there are two new Senators, Nyle Monday from the MLK Library and Matheo Hurtado Martinez from Athletics. In addition, Senator Toby Matoush was re-elected.
From the College of Humanities and the Arts, Senator Sharmin Khan was re-elected.
From the College of Science, Senator Rachel French was re-elected.
From the College of Social Sciences, Senators Julia Curry and Mary Wilson were re-elected.
From the CSU Statewide Senate, Senator Simon Rodan was re-elected.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

The Election Calendar of 2018-2019 was approved unanimously.

V. Unfinished Business:

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

Senator Schultz-Krohn presented ***AS 1688, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds F83-10, ELM Exam; Sanctions; Probation (First Reading).*** Senator Shifflett presented a motion to suspend the rules and make AS 1688 a final reading. The motion was seconded and approved. **The Senate voted and AS 1688 was approved unanimously.**

Senator Schultz-Krohn presented ***AS 1689, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds S80-9, Resource Analysis Required for Curricular Proposals (First Reading).***
Senator Shifflett presented a motion to suspend the rules and make AS 1689 a final reading. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously. **The Senate voted and AS 1689 was approved unanimously.**

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

Senator Sullivan-Green presented ***AS 1686, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds S66-11, College Reports to Selective Service Boards (Final Reading).*** **The Senate voted and AS 1686 was approved unanimously.**

C. Professional Standards (PS) Committee:

Senator Peter presented ***AS 1690, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to S13-6 (Campus Awards) To Provide for System Award Nominations (First Reading).***

Questions:

Q: On lines 484 and 485, does the reference to the last three mean the last three years of winners on our campus, or does it mean the last three applicants from the current year? My second question is whether the committee is the group that determines if something we do is similar?

A: The answer to the first question is the last three awardees. I'm not quite following what you are asking in the second question?

Q: On lines 481 and 482, does the committee determine if we have a parallel internal SJSU award?

A: That would probably have to be determined before the committee was formed by the chair of the Senate in conjunction with the Executive Committee.

Q: On lines 474 to 476, when it talks about the prior recipients, will this award require current members of the faculty, or can some of the faculty be retired?

A: Unless it specifies otherwise, the faculty would have to be current faculty members. Our current award committees use only current faculty and this is meant to parallel those committees.

Q: Would the committee consider expanding the membership to possibly include retired personnel, since this is a culminating award usually given at the end of one's career and retired faculty could offer more knowledge?

A: Certainly, the committee will consider it.

Q: Has the committee considered the Oscar's problem and whether it might be good to include new eyes with a fresh view, instead of the same committee members year-after-year?

A: The committee will consider this.

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

Senator Shifflett presented ***AS 1678, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to S17-6, Departmental Voting Rights (Final Reading).***

The Senate voted and AS 1678 was approved unanimously.

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

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

Senator Shifflett presented ***AS 1693, Policy Recommendation, Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Committee (First Reading).***

O&G has modified the charge and membership of the ADAPC. There is one error in lines 86 and 87 where it reads, "and greater community." That was an error and should be removed.

Questions:
Q: Will all the ex officio members be voting members?
A: Yes.

Q: Why is the AS representative not designated by AS and instead specific to the AS Director of Programming?
A: O&G looked at the duties and responsibilities for all directors in AS and decided the AS Director of Programming was the best fit.
Q: Would the committee consider leaving this as the AS President or designee, because some of the positions change title and AS is in the process of changing the AS Board of Directors and their charges.
A: The committee will consider it.

Q: How many current members are on ADAPC?
A: The ones listed here plus another 3 seats.

B. University Library Board (ULB):
Chair Taylor presented ***AS 1592, Sense of the Senate Resolution, To Support Open Access Publishing and Promote the Retention of Author Rights Among SJSU Faculty (First Reading).***
This Sense of the Senate Resolution was proposed by the University Library Board. This resolution is a request for this body to throw its weight behind encouraging our faculty to publish in open access journals. There is some language in this resolution that defines what that means. Electronic journals are expensive and getting more expensive. You can now pay a little extra to get your article freely available in a hybrid journal. No one actually saves any money from that. Some of the private universities, like Harvard and the UC system, are now restricting their faculty from publishing in any journals that do not allow them to retain any rights after the fact. If you would like to publish a paper by a Biology professor at Harvard and you are a journal editor, then you need to agree to allow that professor to publish either a pre or post print version of their article in the campus repository. This resolution is not a policy resolution. We are not looking to dictate behavior, but we think it is important for the campus to make a statement about the importance of open access publishing.

Questions:
Q: Thank you. I think this is very important. I was wondering if there might be anything you could add to address repository open access journals?
A: Yes, the committee will consider it.

Q: Could you include some language about predatory journals?
A: The committee will definitely look at it.

Q: If this were to become policy at say Harvard and the UC System, would this then become a CSU System-wide issue?
A: If this body were to adopt this Sense of the Senate Resolution then we would consider having our CSU Statewide representatives bring forth something similar at

the CSU Statewide level. Only then would we have the gravity to affect this type of policy.

Q: A Sense of the Senate Resolution generally points to concerns and brings forth some options or recommendations for actions. I could read this in a negative way. In line 35, this suggests that the RTP committees are not using high quality and rigorous peer-reviewed journals to publish their scholarly work in.
A: Do you have a suggestion as to the language? We thought by saying "continue" that it implied it was already being done.
Q: I'll follow up.

Q: I think this is a little optimistic. There are more open access journals that are not quality journals than are quality journals. I also believe that supporting open access needs resources, and the money must come from somewhere. That is going to come down to departments to pay for open access. Also, not all disciplines have open access options. This is implying that is what the university wants, so what happens if it isn't an option for them? This puts pressure on those faculty members.
A: Thank you. The committee will consider it.

Q: There is a view that open access means not peer reviewed or predatory. There are negative connotations to open access. Perhaps the way to do that is to emphasize retaining rights from publication in our repository. I think we need to emphasize that faculty retain rights even when they publish in a main stream journal if a free copy is put up on our repository that gives open access as well as publishing in a conventional setting. There might need some wordsmithing. The other question I have is how did this end up passing in the UC? Is it only because they are powerful so they can force journals to accept this, or are the journals just accepting this and working with the UC without coercive pressures? How far can we go?
A: That is a great point about retaining rights versus publishing in open access journals. We would like our resolution to address both.

Q: Could you explain your last resolved? What is contained in that UC policy that is not already in this resolution?
A: Good question. With regard to the UC Open Access policy, it was passed by the Academic Senate of the UC and it grants the license to distribute those works in the institutional repository. In cases where the publisher precludes that item from being in the repository, or has an embargo for example, then those type of conditions apply, but it is a blanket license to distribute.

Q: In terms of the formality of the Sense of the Senate, we can only resolve to do things that the Senate can do. In other words, we can't resolve that RTP Committees do anything. We can only encourage RTP Committee to do things. We also can't resolve that the faculty do anything, we can only resolve that the Senate encourage faculty to do something. Would the committee consider cleaning up the language?
A: Yes.

Q: To what extent have the librarians and the faculty on the campus weighed in on this with their advice and suggestions?
A: The input has generally been from the University Library Board and its members.

Q: I think it is very important that the Senate weigh in on open access, but it is just a matter of whether or not we can afford it.
A: The committee will consider.

Q: I have a question about the votes. There were a significant number of people absent during the vote. Can you comment on this?
A: We have had some problems filling some seats on the ULB this year. For example, Cabrera is on sabbatical and Kim was named but never seated. Chair Frazier suggested Chair Taylor speak with him about this. Chair Taylor also noted that a lot of people were also absent that day.

Q: Did the ULB consider Senate Management Resolution SM-S08-2, that created a task force that dealt with Open Access and then they gave a final report that is on the website that may help here?
A: Thank you. We did not know about this. The committee will look at this.

Q: On lines 40 to 43, could you clean-up the language in the second half of this?
A: Thank you.

Q: How much data do you actually have on this?
A: Quite a bit of data, we have librarian (level four) research impact. It also turns out to be a happy by product of moving to the faculty 180 system.

Q: In regards to RTP, I was wondering to what extent you would like to have RTP recommendations in this resolution? Especially given that faculty are already publishing with open access.
A: That is a great question. We are not the Professional Standards Committee. Our idea here is to encourage and make aware. We are certainly not trying to craft a resolution that would make RTP Committees nervous or feel manipulated. This is strictly just an awareness resolution.

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

Senator Schultz-Krohn presented ***AS 1691, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds University Policy S09-5, Priority Registration (First Reading).***

University Policy F17-4 established the process for priority registration. That policy rescinded University Policy F14-1 and F14-1 rescinded University Policies F11-3 and F09-1. University Policy F09-1 rescinded University Policies F97-1 and F06-5. We are trying to rescind an amendment for a policy that no longer exists. University Policy F09-5 amended F97-1 and that has already been rescinded. That's why we are asking for this clean-up.

The Senate discussed that fact that with the Senate Administrator's new system of policy numbering and giving amendments letters while keeping the same policy number, this type of issue should not occur with future policies. As a point of parliamentary procedure, since the original policy was rescinded, the amendment would also be rescinded. However, since the amendment was a standalone policy, O&G asked C&R to rescind it.

The Senate Administrator commented that bylaw 16 allows her to bring to the policy committee's attention any policy that should have been rescinded and was missed by accident and if the policy committee agrees, then they can direct the Senate Administrator to rescind the policy. The Senate Administrator will then report this to the Senate. The Senate agreed to consider handling it this way in the future.

Senator Buzanski presented a motion to suspend the rules and make this a final reading. The motion was seconded. The Buzanski motion passed. **The Senate voted and AS 1691 passed unanimously.**

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

Questions:
Q: Can't I, if I'm an interim dean, continue as a committee member and still give the student all the support they need? Why not leave the policy as it is and not specify that an MPP can chair a student committee, and put the chair in a position to say as provost or dean no you can't?
A: This is a referral that came in and we are trying to address the questions that were posed.

Q: Under I.C. when it talks about qualified individuals it says including part-time temporary faculty. Couldn't that instead say, "lecturers"?
A: The committee will consider, but the only thing we inserted was language in section I.B.

Q: I understand the continuity argument, so for example if Dean Kaufman was chairing a student's committee before he entered the administrative track then this amendment would allow him to continue as chair, but would this amendment also allow Dean Jacobs to become a new chair of a thesis committee?
A: Yes, what we tried to do was keep this at the local level having consent from the department chair and school directors.
Q: This seems a little awkward that a chair could end up telling a dean whether they can chair a committee.

Q: I would just like to emphasize that if the department chair says no that they will be saying no to their leader and that could be complicated. This could create some toxicity in the college in the long term, so will the committee reconsider this?

A: Yes, the committee will discuss this again.

Q: My request to the committee is that the rationale be made clearer. The whereas makes it appear to be self-evident that an MPP should automatically be able to chair, but there is no context there or rationale?
A: The committee will consider it.

C: In the committee when we were discussing this, we weren't thinking of it just in alignment with your direct supervisor or administrator. We were thinking that it could be interdisciplinary, so it could be in a completely different college. From that perspective, there is perhaps a little less pressure on a chair to deny someone that is an administrator in a completely different area. We were trying to think of the array of possibilities.

Q: I believe in the beginning you said you had spoken to MPPs to find out if the original intent was to have MPPs as chairs, or not have MPPs as chairs, and it seems you got feedback on both sides. My question is with that being said, what was the impetus to then put this forward going only one direction, when the input represented two sides?
A: The referral was asking for clarity about the language and when it was discussed by the chairs and directors, they felt the language should remain the same. Then when we discussed with the MPPs, the concern was that this might be prohibitive if the individual was in an interim position and that could put the student at a disadvantage. The policy as it is written right now doesn't love MPPs serving as chairs on committees, but the referral that came to us was specifically to clarify the language. The answer might be that the language is clear as it stands, but as a committee we felt that it was worth bringing to this body to have the body review it instead of just the committee.

Senator Schultz-Krohn presented ***AS 1695, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to F88-9, BA/BS Differentiation and Definition (First Reading).***
Senator Shifflett presented a motion to suspend the rules and make AS 1695 a final reading. The Senate voted and the Shifflett motion passed with 1 Nay. Senator Chin presented an amendment to the Resolved clause to read, "Resolved: In compliance with Title 5 Sections 40508, 40500, and 40501, F88-9 shall be amended as follows:" The amendment was seconded. **The Senate voted and the Chin amendment passed with 8 Abstentions**. Senator Van Selst presented a motion to return to committee. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the Van Selst motion failed (9-31-5). **The Senate voted and AS 1695 passed as amended with 1 Nay and 2 Abstentions**.

D. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
Senator Sullivan-Green presented ***AS 1696, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy S17-13, Undergraduate Student Honors at San José State University (First Reading).***
This is an amendment to the Student Honors policy as a result of a referral regarding

how students achieve student honors. Student Honors used to be based on a semester achievement rather than a two semester achievement. We have found that the new policy has increased the number of students that receive honors significantly. In order to be in compliance with the policy, and also assist the Provost Office in being able to honor all students, we are proposing that we amend section 2.7.1 so that it would lose the language that gives a procedural direction to the Provost Office. Instead of directing that students be honored at the spring convocation, it would instead say they will be recognized by the Provost Office.

Questions:
Q: I believe this came about because we do not have a facility large enough to hold all of the students for the Honors Convocation, is this correct?
A: Yes.
Q: Does this then lead us down a path of doing away with Honors Convocation?
A: I think that depends on how you look at it. From conversations with the Provost Office, there is no intent to eliminate the Honors Convocation. This just gives the Provost Office the flexibility to make the decision to perhaps honor students at alternating years, or something along that format.

Q: At the risk of saying the obvious, isn't the solution to restrict the honors to a more elite group that will fit in the building rather than watering down the language of the policy so that some years there may not be an honors convocation depending on the size of the group?
A: There was discussion about that. The primary reason the committee leaned against that is that this new version of doing it semester-to-semester is consistent with other CSUs, also determining honors should not be dependent on physical facilities on campus. Students should be honored for an achievement they have made and not whether they can fit in a building or not. The other thing to consider is that we are increasing our student body, so if we restrict it now and in a few years we have more students coming on campus then will we have to restrict it even more to continue to fit in the facility?

E. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
Senator Peter presented ***AS 1682, Policy Recommendation, Amends University Policies S99-8 and S99-8, Declaring our Support for Academic Freedom and Establishing the Academic Freedom Committee (Final Reading).***
Senator Peter presented several friendly amendments. On line 90 delete "the statement" where it is repeated. On line 158, take the bold off of "1.3.2." On line 198, replace "emereti" with "emeriti." On line 199 replace "2 years" with "two-year." Senator Sen presented a friendly amendment to strike the word "touch" on line 28. Senator Peter presented an amendment to change line 203 to read, "3.1.2. One student, for a one-year renewable term." The amendment was seconded. The Peter amendment passed unanimously." Senator Stacks presented an amendment to line 203 to change it to read, "3.1.3. One Administrator, for a one-year renewable term." Senator Buzanski presented a substitute amendment to the Stacks Amendment to change line 203 to read, "One Administrator to serve for a term designated by the

President." And, to change line 218 to read, "3.4.3. The Administrative representative shall possess knowledge and interest in Academic Freedom and shall be designated by the President after consultation with the Executive Committee." The amendment was seconded. Senator Stacks withdrew her amendment. The Senate voted on the Buzanski change to line 218 and the amendment failed. The Senate then voted on the amendment to line 203 and it passed with 1 Abstention. **The Senate voted and AS 1682 passed unanimously as amended**.

Senator Peter presented ***AS 1683, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to F81-7, Appointment Procedures for Grant-Related Instructional Faculty of Exceptional Merit: (GRIF).***
Senator Peter announced that he had received some suggestions for changes from Senator Stacks and that the Professional Standards Committee was withdrawing the resolution in order to consider these suggestions.

VII. State of the University Reports:

A. AS President:

AS President Manzo announced that AS still has scholarships available and students can apply through Friday, April 13, 2018.

Elections are underway and the results will be announced by this Thursday. There are currently several AS Director vacancies still available.

AS is working on a draft of their 8 million budget.

The AS student government is being restructured. One idea being proposed is an academic council with eight representatives from the eight different colleges. It would also have a graduate student representative.

AS will be reviewing their Executive Director on an annual basis.

There were 20 students that applied for the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) funds that AS allocated to the Crisis Response Team in the amount of $501 each. AS is looking into whether they can use the leftover funds to provide funds for Temporary Protective Status (TPS).

Questions:
Q: You mentioned elections, can you comment on the percentage of students that participated in the elections?
A: The AS President served on the elections board two times. The first year they were able to increase the percentage of students that voted to 8%. The second and third year it increased to 9%. Last year voting increased to 13% and that is the highest AS has ever had it. Last year AS tried to increase the incentives to get students to vote and gave out door prizes to students that voted, they also lowered the number of voting days to three days, and AS provided iPads for students to vote on. In addition, AS held candidate debates. However, AS still has not been

able to significantly increase voting. This year there were also quite a number of vacant seats that no one ran for.

B. Provost: No report.

C. Vice President for Administration and Finance: No report.

D. Vice President for Student Affairs:
On Saturday there will be over 10,000 prospective students on campus along with their families for Admitted Spartan Day.

Summer registration begins today with sections starting on June 4, 2018.

Fall registration begins on May 1, 2018.

April 11, 2018 is the 20th Anniversary of the MOSAIC Cross Cultural Center on campus.

This is Asian-Pacific Islander, Lesbian-Gay-Bisexual-Transgender (LGBT) Pride, and Sexual Assault Awareness month.

Student Affairs had 527 students at the mobile food pantry today.

SA is looking for a place to have a permanent food pantry setup on campus.

Question:
Q: I understand there was money allocated from the Chancellor's Office for a permanent food pantry. Can you comment on this?
A: Senate Bill 85 passed and allocated $245 million to the CSU as a whole and SJSU applied for grants and received $130,000. That will be used primarily for a permanent food pantry. The funds will be used to assist with Calfresh signup and Student Affairs is looking for ways to address with student homelessness.

E. Chief Diversity Officer: No report.

F. CSU Faculty Trustee (by standing invitation): Updates distributed electronically.

G. Statewide Academic Senators:
There is a lot of activity at the CSU Statewide level around mental health.

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, <u>Time Certain: 2:30 p.m.</u>

Chair Nellen commented that the Athletics Board is setup under University Policy F07-2. The Athletics Board has responsibility to protect the environmental and educational rights of the athletes, and to ensure the integrity of the athletic program. It has a special responsibility relating the programs of athletics to the objectives of the university. While the board has these generalized responsibilities, the Division of Intercollegiate Athletics has direct control over its programs and the President has primary responsibility for our Athletics program. The Athletics Board reports both to the Senate and to the President. The Athletics Board makes an annual presentation to the Senate.

Sen Chiao, the FAR, commented that the FAR is a conduit between the university and the Division of Athletics. This past year it has been his pleasure to attend weekly meetings with the coaches and the athletes. He is happy to report on the quality and integrity of these meetings.

Jacquelyn Duysen, the Associate Athletics Director for Compliance, reported that student athlete time demand is a rule under scrutiny by the NCAA right now. The purpose of this rule is to ensure that our student athletes aren't overspending themselves. This rule applies to all required athletic related activity. When our teams are in season, they are maxed out at 20 hours per week for all athletic activity. However, things like having to get taped up, physical therapy, and involuntary workouts, don't currently count in their 20 hours and the Athletics Division is always trying to balance these things out. The Athletics Division takes involuntary workouts very seriously. They must be totally voluntary and the coach cannot know about it. One of the things that Director Duysen makes very clear to her coaches is that if they tell the student that these workouts must be voluntary, but their actions suggest otherwise, the NCAA will consider them involuntary. Students are here to get a degree. Student-Athlete well-being is one of the core values in Athletics. Student Athletes are surveyed about a number of things at the end of each year and involuntary workouts is one of the items they are asked about.

Last year when Director Duysen reported to the Senate, one of issues they were having was getting textbooks in time for student athletes. Director Duysen thanked the Senate for their help. Last year on December 1, 2016 only 40% of faculty had put in their book requests, but this year 100% of faculty put in their book request by December 1, 2017.

Questions:
Q: Do you actually track the hours?
A: Yes, Director Duysen gets the hours from the coaches and then she anonymously sends them out to random students to get their feedback. In addition, students are asked to randomly meet with the Athletics Director and give their feedback regarding things like voluntary workouts.
Q: How many of the 20 hours include travel?

A: None of the travel hours are included.

Eileen Dailey, Senior Associate Athletics Director for Student-Athlete Academic Services reported that SJSU is the national leader in Arthur Ashe Nominations this year with 41 nominations of students of color with a 3.2 or higher grade point average.

Our single year APR for athletics is 972 this is a little lower than we would like to be, but well ahead of the NCAA benchmark of 930. We would like to be at a 985. Our four-year bench mark is a little better at a 980. If a university falls below the 930 benchmark they are subject to scholarship loss, and a loss of practice time as well as other sanctions.

Athletics has the wonderful grades first initiative on campus. The response rate is currently at 46%. The cohort athletics is seeking information on is EOP students, student athletes, underrepresented students that don't fit into the EOP category, and undeclared students. Athletics requested information from professors for about 4,000 students in these categories. What know was they needed to if the students were going to class, whether they are struggling and need a tutor, etc. Athletics hopes by 2021 to have increased the response rate from professors to 90%.

Athletics has been training athletes with regards to Title IX for the last five years. It has become mandatory by the NCAA. Athletics has trained all new incoming student athletes on "One Love," and returning students are participating in the "Sex Signals" program offered on campus. In addition, all athletics staff have received "Unconscious Bias" training by the CDO Kathy Wong(Lau). Football has gone above and beyond in this area and each student has had supplemental training as well. In addition, the Julie Paisant, the Deputy Title IX Coordinator has come out and talked about "Consent and what that means," and Dr. Harry Edwards came out and talked about "Domestic Violence."

Marie Tuite, Director of Athletics, reported that on May 19, 2018, she became the permanent Director of Athletics at SJSU. SJSU is a Division I institution. There are 128 Division I level institutions. Athletics has 20 programs this year and will have 22 next year. There are 13 for women and nine for men. Athletics will be adding indoor and outdoor track next year. There are 450 student athletes and Athletics has a staff of about 130 people.

Director Tuite announced that she has been an adjunct professor at the University of Washington for the past twelve years and she teaches in their master's program.

The Athletics Division recruits athletes that have a good moral compass, are interested in getting a degree, and are interested in competing at a high level. SJSU has a culture of compliance. She tells coaches you will have time to win here, but you will not have time if you don't follow NCAA rules.

Revenue generation is the Athletics Director's job and the job of the entire Athletics Division. The Athletics Division just secured two of their largest gifts. They received a $5 million donation to the football program, and the tennis classic that has been at Stanford will be held at SJSU this year.

Campus engagement is also very important to Director Tuite. The priority for use of South Campus is athletics first, then Kinesiology classes, then club sports, and finally use by the general student body.

Questions:
Q: Can you comment anything about students and concussions and what we are doing about this? As for fundraising, what are you doing differently than any of the other Athletic Directors?
A: First, Director Tuite is not going anywhere. SJSU is where she wants to end her career. Also, President Papazian is the fifth President Director Tuite has worked for. We have to get football in a place where they are something everyone can get excited and get behind like a number of our other programs. We have the right coach now. Also, we are finishing a number of projects on South campus and donors are taking notice of it.

Director Tuite doesn't know what is going to happen in the sport with regard to concussions. They happen in football and soccer and it is a serious issue.

IX. New Business: None

X. Adjournment: 5:00 p.m.

Executive Committee Minutes
April 2, 2018
Noon – 1:30 p.m., ADM 167

Present: Shifflett, Mathur, Sullivan-Green, Riley, Peter, Faas, Frazier, Manzo, Van Selst, Schultz-Krohn, Willey

Absent: Lee, Papazian, Feinstein, Wong(Lau)

1. The minutes of March 19, 2018 were approved as amended.

2. Updates from the Policy Committee Chairs:
    a. From the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee:
    I&SA will be discussing an amendment to F08-2 today regarding advanced enrollment for students that have failed a class and must retake it. I&SA will consider rescinding or replacing S93-7.

    The Senate Chair will be making a referral to I&SA regarding the Honors policy.

    b. From the Professional Standards Committee (PS):
    The Academic Freedom policy will be coming for a final reading to the Senate at the April 9, 2018 meeting.

    PS has been working for about six months on approving new RTP Guidelines.

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

    PS is working on Appointment Procedures for Grant-Related Instructional Faculty of Exceptional Merit (GRIF).

    PS would like to know if there is an organization chart for the new University Personnel Division and if so where it is located.

    PS has a subcommittee working on the issue of bullying and will bring recommendations to the Senate next semester.

PS has asked the Chief Information Officer (CIO) to look at how safe and secure the information on canvas is.

c. From the Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
O&G will be bringing a resolution on voting rights and timely reporting of votes to the April 9, 2018 Senate meeting.

O&G will be sending additional referrals to the other policy committee chairs for additional policy clean-up for the next academic year.

O&G will continue reviewing the charge and membership of university committees and bring recommendations to the Senate next fall.

d. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
C&R has been working on several requests for changes to department names from College of Business departments.

C&R is continuing to work on a resolution regarding the 4+1 blended BA/BS to MA/MS degree.

C&R is also working on a resolution to rescind University Policy S89-2.

In addition, C&R is continuing to make their way through 18 referrals from the O&G Committee.

C&R is considering a change to Thesis Committee Guidelines in University Policy S14-10, that would specify membership and whether an MPP can chair the committee.

AS 1688 and AS 1689 will be coming back to the Senate for final readings at the April 9, 2018 Senate meeting.

3. Updates from the Administrators, AS President, and CSU Statewide Senators:
   a. From the Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA):
   This month is LGBT Pride and Asian-American Women's month.

   Admitted Spartans Day is April 14, 2018.

   The VPSA and the CDO met with the AS President regarding DACA and came up with 16 strategies. Employees will be reminded to refer

questions concerning our students and DACA to the UPD. In addition, the VPSA and CDO will be hosting Town Hall meetings regarding DACA in April 2018. The VPSA and CDO have also instituted a Rapid Response Team that will move into action if one of our students is detained.

Sadly, the VPSA was recently made aware of a movement that began in the U.K. declaring April 3, 2018 as "Punish a Muslim Day."

b. From the Associated Students President (AS):
AS hosted a rapid response training session on campus that had 12 attendees. All students, faculty, and staff are welcome to attend these events.

AS would like to use funds leftover from DACA for Temporary Protective Status (TPS). AS President Manzo is looking into whether AS can legally use DACA funds for TPS.

AS has instituted yearly reviews for their Executive Director position and is currently conducting a review.

AS will be attending a rally in Sacramento to "Fund the Dream" in protest of CSU tuition increases.

AS still has scholarships to award, but the deadline is coming up fast on April 13, 2018.

Voting in AS elections starts next week. There are still four vacant positions that no students are currently running for.

c. From the CSU Statewide Senators:
Senator Van Selst distributed an email to the Senate with CSU Statewide Senate updates on March 19, 2018.

Several issues continue to be discussed in the ASCSU including tenure density, shared governance, mental health, and the role foundations should play in higher education.

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

The VPAF will be conducting a campus safety walk this evening and anyone that wishes to come can join him and meet at 7 p.m. at the FD&O Building.

The VPAF will be conducting a national search for a new Chief of the University Policy Department (UPD). Chief Decena was offered a position as Chief of Police in Los Gatos and he accepted it.

Bicycles on campus continue to be an issue.

Progress is being made on removing graffiti as soon as possible.

The information regarding “Punish a Muslim Day” was sent by an employee to the President and then made it made its way back to the VPAF. This type of information should be sent first to the UPD or the VPAF.

BART has decided to go single bore and this is great news for downtown.

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

‘

These minutes were transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on April 11, 2018. The minutes were reviewed and edited by the Senate Chair, Stefan Frazier, on April 13, 2018. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on April 9, 2018.

Consent Calendar April 30 2018

Committee	Last Name/First Name	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
Program Planning Committee	Ramasubramanian, Anand	2019		L/ENG

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY AS 1676
Academic Senate
Curriculum and Research Committee
April 30, 2018
Final Reading

POLICY RECOMMENDATION
Department or School Name Change

Rationale: There is no current policy guiding a name change for departments or schools.

Legislative History: When a name change is proposed due to merging, dividing, or transferring academic units, use this policy in conjunction with S13-9.

On March 12, 2018, the Academic Senate approved AS 1676 presented by Senator Schultz-Krohn for the Curriculum and Research Committee. The policy recommendation was then sent to the President for signature as University Policy S18-4. This policy recommendation was returned unsigned by President Papazian with a request to make the policy recommendation less prescriptive and remove the name of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs (GUP) as the location of the Department or School Name Change Guidelines and indicate that the Guidelines are maintained by the Office of the Provost or designee.

The Curriculum and Research Committee, during the April 23, 2018 meeting, revised this policy recommendation by removing the specific name of GUP as the location of the Department or School Name Change Guidelines and indicating that these Guidelines are maintained by the Office of the Provost.

Whereas The campus community would benefit from an operational roadmap to ensure procedural transparency when proposing a department or school name change; and

Whereas The process to be used when requesting a department or school name change should allow the review of the proposed name change to occur in a timely manner, and

Whereas A policy should guide meaningful consultation across academic units to avoid conflict with a requested name change; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Department or School Name Change Guidelines shall specify the components to be included in the name change proposal and submission process, and be it further

Resolved That the Guidelines shall be maintained by the Office of the Provost or designee and reviewed by the University Curriculum & Research Committee, and be it further

Resolved That the following process shall be used when requesting a name change for a department or school.

1. The name change proposal shall follow the Name Change Guidelines and include evidence of meaningful consultation with all academic units potentially affected by the proposed name change.
2. The name change proposal shall provide a record of the vote at all levels of review.
3. The University Curriculum & Research Committee shall review the name change proposal and forward a recommendation to the Provost.

Approved:	April 30, 2018
Vote:	13-0-0
Present:	Bacich, Buzanski, Cargill, Chung, Heil, Stacks, Rodan, Trulio, Schultz-Krohn, Anagnos, Matoush, De Guzman, Jensen
Absent:	None
Workload Impact:	Minimal; will use existing committees and curriculum management system
Financial Impact:	Minimal; will use existing committees and curriculum management system

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
Academic Senate
Professional Standards Committee
April 30, 2018 **AS 1683**
Final Reading

POLICY RECOMMENDATION
Amendment A to F81-7
"Appointment Procedures for Grant-Related Instructional Faculty of Exceptional Merit" (GRIF)

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

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

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

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

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

Approved: *April 16, 2018*
Vote: *8-0-0*
Present: *Chin, He, Marachi, McKee, Peter, Donahue, Kimbarow*
Absent: *White, Kauppila*
Financial Impact: *None.*
Workload Impact: *None.*

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. Normally, department recruitment committees, college ~~school~~ policy committees, department chairs, and college ~~school~~ deans should be consulted, with final approval from the Provost ~~Academic Vice President~~ and the President.

2. Appointment Procedures.

~~Appointment procedures for these classes shall be developed as follows:~~

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.

~~2.3.~~ Specific selection procedures. Procedures for selection of recipients of particular grants shall be developed 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. ~~Procedures for selection of recipients of particular grants shall be developed by a similar process of consultation.~~ Procedures will necessarily vary because of differences in the nature and terms of funding arrangements, but should include specific provisions relating to recruitment of candidates (whether by national ~~affirmative action~~ search; nomination by grantor, university faculty, university administrators, etc.) and the final selection. ~~Whenever possible, normal university procedures for the recruitment and selection of faculty should be used. 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 Academic Vice President and the President~~.

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

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
Academic Senate
Professional Standards Committee
April 30, 2018 **AS 1690**
Final Reading

Policy Recommendation
Amendment A to S13-6 (Campus Awards)
To Provide for System Award Nominations

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

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

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

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

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

- We record this language in the campus awards policy, where it plausibly 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 two of the awards—they have always required tenure but this was buried in the fine print, leading to some confusion.

Professional Standards also recommends making the awards more inclusive in two ways. First, we have recommended some additional language to guide the Executive Committee in staffing the selection committees to focus on "diversity of membership." Second, we have opened up the Distinguished Service Award to those Student Service Professionals who are classified as faculty by the Senate Bylaws but who are currently not eligible for any campus awards. This seems like an appropriate award for faculty who dedicate their careers to serving students.

Approved:	*April 23, 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.*

~~OUTSTANDING PROFESSOR, PRESIDENT'S SCHOLAR, DISTINGUISHED SERVICE, and OUTSTANDING LECTURER AWARDS~~
CAMPUS FACULTY AWARDS AND NOMINATIONS FOR SYSTEM FACULTY AWARDS

I. Purpose

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

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

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

II. Information Relevant for All Four Campus Awards

A. Eligibility

1. To be eligible for any of the four faculty awards, an individual must:

   a. Be a ~~Unit 3~~ faculty member as defined by the Senate Constitution and Bylaws; and

   b. Not be part of the Management Personnel Plan (MPP status) either when nominated or selected; and

   c. Not be retired (although retirement during the academic year does not forfeit eligibility for that year). A previously tenured faculty who has relinquished tenure to participate in an early retirement program (e.g. FERP) will be eligible during the first year of the retirement program. He or she will be regarded for this policy as retaining the academic rank held prior to the early retirement; and

   d. Not have been awarded the particular award previously.

2. Additional requirements for particular awards:
   a. For the President's Scholar award, nominees must have attained the rank of Professor.

b. For the Outstanding Lecturer Award, a lecturer must have been at SJSU for at least six semesters.
c. For the President's Scholar award and the Outstanding Professor Award~~, and the Distinguished Service award,~~ nominees must have earned tenure at San Jose State University.
d. For the Distinguished Service award, nominees must either have earned tenure at San Jose State University or have been a full time Student Services Professional III or IV employee continuously for six years.

B. Nomination Process

1. A Calendar organizing the deadlines for campus awards ~~all parts of the process~~ shall be created by mutual consent of the President and the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. This Calendar will be distributed with the annual announcement and instructions for nominations. If the President and Executive Committee do not act, the default dates will be as follows:
    a. Awards and calendar to be announced and publicized no later than October 1.
    b. Nominations are due by October 31 (if that date falls on the weekend, then the due date will be the following Monday).
    c. Selection committees will be formed no later than October 31.
    d. Committee recommendations shall be delivered to the President no later than March 1.
    e. The President will announce the awards no later than April 1.

2. The Senate Office and President's Office will work together to coordinate the sending of a notice to the entire campus community soliciting nominations for each of the four awards. A single announcement will be used for all four awards. That announcement will include the above eligibility factors, and refer people to this policy for a description of each award (with the web location provided in the letter). A single nomination form (see the Appendix of this policy) will be used for each award and be attached to the memo distributed to the campus community. Nominations are to be accompanied by 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.

3. Nominations may come from any source including self-nominations. Deans should publicize the awards within their colleges and encourage nominations for all four awards from all sources.

4. It shall be the responsibility of the Administrative Chair of each committee to arrange for unsuccessful nominations and their supporting materials to be retained for three years. Nominations will remain active for consideration for three years, with nominees given the option of submitting additional or revised materials with each annual cycle. After three years the nominee's materials will be discarded and a new set of materials would be required if the candidate is nominated again.

C. Selection Process

1. Separate selection committees will be formed annually for each award. The members of each selection committee are described at Sections III, IV, and V and VI of this policy. The Executive Committee of the Senate will work with the President in forming each of the four ~~three~~ committees. In this selection process, effort should be made to ensure that at least one member also served on the selection committee in the prior year in order to provide continuity for the committees. In addition, the Executive Committee and the President should strive for broad representation of the colleges <u>as well as diversity of membership</u>.

2. Each selection committee will review the nominations to select the nominees for whom further information is desired. The selection committee will determine the type of information needed to make its selection, but such information at a minimum will include the nominee's curriculum vitae and self-verification of their eligibility (as described in section II.A. of this policy). The selection committees will set their own process and schedule for receiving and reviewing information, but must forward their recommendations to the President by the date established by the annual awards calendar.

3. General guidelines for the selection committees are provided in Section VII of this policy.

D. Role of the Academic Senate and the President

1. The Academic Senate Office and the President's Office will work together in notifying the campus community of the request for nominations. The Senate Office will receive the nominations and ensure that they are delivered to the chairs of each selection committee. The Senate Office will also assist each committee in corresponding with nominees.

2. The Senate Executive Committee will work with the President to select the members of each selection committee as described in Sections III, IV, and V of this policy.

3. The President will select the recipient of each award from a list of three unranked faculty selected by the selection committees.

4. The President's Office is responsible for notifying the award recipients, and for funding and arranging for the issuance of the awards.

5. Confidentiality of all information will be maintained at all times.

E. Form of Award

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

III. Outstanding Professor Award

A. Purpose of the Award

To recognize a faculty member for overall excellence in teaching ~~and~~ service to students. ~~academic assignment.~~

B. Criteria

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

1. Teaching Excellence

   a. Evidence of teaching excellence exists as demonstrated through SOTE scores, other student evaluations, peer evaluations, external reviews, etc.

   b. Teaches a variety of courses.

   c. Participates in professional and scholarly activities that enhance teaching ability and currency in the discipline.

   d. Serves as a mentor to other educational professionals.

2. Commitment to Students

a. Advises students through student organizations, theses, and/or other projects.

b. Participates in student orientation and advisement activities.

c. Mentors students regarding career and graduate school considerations.

d. Engages in service to the campus and/or profession that benefits students.

C. Selection Committee

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

IV. President's Scholar Award

A. Purpose of the Award

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

B. Criteria

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

C. Selection Committee

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

V. Distinguished Service Award

A. Purpose of the Award

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

B. Criteria

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

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

1. Contribution to the SJSU Mission

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

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

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

2. Significant Contribution

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

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

3. On-Going Commitment

   a. The faculty member has made a consistent contribution of service.

b. The faculty member's service record represents multiple years of commitment.

C. Selection Committee

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

VI. Outstanding Lecturer Award

A. Purpose

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

B. Criteria

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

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

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

   e. Serving as a mentor to other educational professionals.

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

   a. Advising students through student organizations and/or other projects.

b. Participating in student orientation and advisement activities.

c. Mentoring students regarding career and graduate school considerations.

d. Engaging in service to the campus and/or profession that benefits students.

3. Contributions Beyond Teaching – which might be evidenced by consistency of:

a. Service on university, college and/or department committees or projects that provide a meaningful benefit to the campus.

b. Service to the campus or profession that demonstrates leadership and initiative.

c. High quality scholarship, performances, or creative activities.

C. Selection Committee

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

VII. General Guidelines for Selection Committees

A. General Guidance

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

B. Reminders for each Selection Committee:

1. Establish a schedule that will allow sufficient time for nominations to be reviewed, eligibility verified, determination by the committee of the type of documentation to be prepared by nominees, nominees' preparation of the required documentation, and review of the nominee materials. The committee needs to forward the names of the top three nominees (unranked) to the President by the date established by the President in conjunction with each committee chair but no later than March 1.

2. The Office of Faculty Affairs can assist the committee if it needs to verify the eligibility of any nominee.

3. If the committee determines that the number of nominees is greater than the number who should be asked for further documentation, a "first cut" should be made based on the nominating letters. If the committee determines that an insufficient number of nominations have been made, it should consult with the Chair of the Senate about sending out another request for nominations.

4. Decide what additional documentation should be requested from nominees, such as letters of recommendation or a personal statement. At a minimum, nominees are to submit a curriculum vitae. A discussion of the purpose of the award and the criteria (as set out in this policy) should help the committee in deciding upon the documentation to request.

5. Decide upon an approach for reviewing the nomination letters and the information provided by nominees, and for selecting the top three nominees.

6. After the top three nominees have been selected, a summary of the significant qualifications of each should be forwarded to the President's Office along with the nominating letters and information provided by each of the three nominees. The three nominees submitted to the President should be unranked. If the committee determines there are fewer than three qualified candidates, then fewer than three nominees should be forwarded. If the committee determines that there is no qualified candidate, then no names should be forwarded and the award not given in that year.

7. The committee chair should arrange for mailing of letters to nominees to request additional information, as well as thank you letters upon completion of the process. The President's Office will also send a congratulatory letter to the recipient of the award, and optionally, to the other two finalists.

8. Committee members are to maintain confidentiality of the nominee names, documentation, and evaluation comments.

VIII. System Awards.

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 as follows:

i. Each committee shall be chaired by an administrator appointed by the President.
ii. Each committee shall include three prior recipients of campus or system based awards, with the provision that no committee members may be candidates for the current award;
iii. Committee members should so far as possible be selected for their expertise or achievements in the area(s) covered by the system award.
iv. In forming committees, effort should be made to ensure that at least one member also served on the selection committee in the prior year in order to provide continuity for the committees. In addition, committees should strive for broad representation of the colleges as well as diversity of membership.

D. The nominating committee will consider any applications or nominations that emerge from an open call. In addition, when the committee determines that the 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.

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: _____

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY **AS 1696**
Academic Senate
Instruction and Student Affairs Committee
April 30, 2018
Final Reading

POLICY RECOMMENDATION
Amendment A to University Policy S17-13
Undergraduate Student Honors at San José State University

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

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

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

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

Approved:	April 16, 2018
Vote:	16-0-0
Present:	Bullen, Busick, Hill, Hospidales, Gill, Grindstaff (Non-voting), Khan, Kim, Manzo, Nash, Ng (Non-voting), Sen, Simpson, Sullivan-Green, Trousdale, Walters, Wilson, Yao
Financial impact:	Unknown
Workload impact:	Unknown

San José State University
Academic Senate
Organization and Government Committee AS 1697
April 30, 2018
Final Reading

Senate Management Resolution
Rescind SM-S95-2 (Standing Rule 6 Amendment)

Legislative History: SM-S95-2 which added reporting from the Director of Advancement to standing rule 6 was superseded by SM-F97-2. In addition, a constitutional amendment removed the VP for advancement seat from the senate and the standing rules were accordingly updated.

Whereas: SM-S95-2, though superseded, was not removed from the active list of Senate management resolutions, therefore be it

Resolved: That SM-S95-2 be rescinded.

Rationale: To correct an oversight, SM-S95-2 needs to be rescinded as it has been superseded.

Approved:	4/16/18
Vote:	9-0-0
Present:	Bailey, Curry, French, Hart, Norman, Ormsbee, Rajkovic, Ramasubramanian, Shifflett
Absent:	Higgins, Grosvenor
Financial Impact:	None
Workload Impact:	None

San José State University
Academic Senate
Organization and Government Committee AS 1698
April 30, 2018
Final Reading

Policy Recommendation
Rescind F97-4 (Educational Equity Advisory Board)

Legislative History: F97-4 (Educational Equity Advisory Board) dissolved the educational equity advisory board, the outreach council, the retention council, and reorganized the Faculty Enhancement Council as an administrative agency in the Senate's 'other' classification for committees with the name Educational Equity Council.

Whereas: The Educational Equity Council no longer exists, and

Whereas: Significant changes in infrastructure and programming have been made since 1997 with respect to issues related to diversity, and

Whereas: The council's purpose and objectives are now incorporated in campus programs and structures such as the faculty diversity committee, a recently established Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, a student success committee, and a center for faculty development, therefore be it

Resolved: That F97-4 (Educational Equity Advisory Board) be rescinded.

Rationale: F97-4 sought to update and reorganize disparate efforts in the area of educational equity with a focus on fostering positive and effective rapport between students and faculty and facilitating faculty development and involvement. Since that time, the campus has undertaken several initiatives designed to impact not only faculty but students and the campus as a whole. With the educational equity council no longer in existence and its work embraced by current groups, F97-4 needs to be rescinded.

Approved:	4/16/18
Vote:	9-0-0
Present:	Bailey, Curry, French, Hart, Norman, Ormsbee, Rajkovic, Ramasubramanian, Shifflett
Absent:	Grosvenor, Higgins
Financial Impact:	None
Workload Impact:	None

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
Academic Senate
Professional Standards Committee
April 30, 2018 **AS 1699**
Final Reading

POLICY RECOMMENDATION
Amendment G to S15-7 (RTP Procedures)
Clarifying the period of review for Periodic "Annual" Reviews for Probationary Faculty

Resolved: That S15-7 be amended as shown by the addition of a sentence as shown underlined in the following excerpt from the policy.

Rationale: *Definitions and explanation of the process: During their probationary period, tenure track faculty undergo a number of major "performance reviews" which determine whether they will be retained, granted tenure, or promoted. The contract and our policy specifies that in those years in which faculty do not undergo one of these major "performance reviews" they instead undergo a smaller "periodic" or annual review. These periodic reviews are sometimes call "mini" reviews. These smaller review are intended to be formative and developmental—giving faculty feedback so as to help faculty stay on track toward tenure.*

The problem: In order to provide probationary faculty with quality feedback as they progress toward tenure, a periodic review needs to examine all of the faculty member's achievements since the last review. However, due to the imbalanced calendar in which full performance reviews begin in the fall while the smaller periodic reviews begin in the spring, there are circumstances in which some achievements "fall through the cracks" and are not captured in the cycle of periodic reviews. (Note that this is a problem only for the periodic reviews, since the full performance reviews are cumulative and comprehensive.) For example, if a faculty member submits a full performance review in October of 2017, the next periodic review would not be due until AY 2018-19, an be submitted in March 2019.

Since there is no definition of the timespan to be covered by the "periodic review" there have been a number of different interpretations developed over the years. At one point it was assumed that the periodic review covered materials only for that particular Academic Year. In the case of the example above, this would omit all the material produced from October 2017 through August 2018. More recently a better interpretation has prevailed

which is that the periodic review should cover the two prior semesters. While an improvement, this still would omit materials from October through December of the prior year, unless they were included through the "late add" process and thus reviewed during the prior performance review.

The solution: We add a simple sentence that defines the period of review to include all materials since the last review.

Approved:	*April 23, 2018*
Vote:	*10-0-0*
Present:	*Chin, He, Marachi, Kauppila, McKee, White, Peter, Donahue, Pyeon, Kimbarow*
Absent:	*None*
Financial Impact:	*No direct impacts.*
Workload Impact:	*No direct impacts.*

POLICY RECOMMENDATION
Amending S15-7 (RTP Procedures)
Clarifying the period of review for Periodic "Annual" Reviews for Probationary Faculty

…

2.2.2 Normally, probationary faculty shall submit annual summaries of achievements for periodic evaluation every year in which they do not submit a full performance review. The annual summary shall cover achievements since the last review (whether a performance review or a periodic evaluation,) or the appointment date if there has not yet been a review. Department committees, department chairs, and college deans shall consider an annual summary of achievements prepared by the faculty member, evaluations of teaching, and the cumulative record of previous evaluations and recommendations by committees and administrators. Copies of their observations and suggestions shall be given to the faculty member; the original evaluation shall be placed in the official Personnel Action File, and copies included in subsequent years' dossiers.

…

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
Academic Senate **AS 1700**
Instruction and Student Affairs Committee
April 30, 2018
First Reading

POLICY RECOMMENDATION
Amendment A to University Policy F08-2
Repetition of Courses; Academic Renewal

Whereas, F08-2 prohibits students from registering for a course during Advanced Registration; and

Whereas, this prohibition negatively affects students' progress to degree; and

Whereas, departments have difficulty managing student demand for courses when these students are unable to be tracked in PeopleSoft; therefore be it

Resolved, that F08-2, Section I.A. and I.A.1, be amended to say:

I.A. *Undergraduate and post-baccalaureate students (regular enrollment and Open University) may repeat courses only if they earned grades lower than a C (including WU, IC, and NC).* ***Special programs, such as credential programs, that are governed by external standards may require grades higher than a C. In courses specific to those programs, a course repeat may be permitted when the grade does not meet the necessary standard.*** *Graduate students may repeat courses only if they earned grades lower than a B (including WU, IC, and NC). Repeating a course with an Incomplete ("I") grade is not allowed; a grade must be assigned or the "I" must revert to an "IC" prior to repeating the course.*

I.A.1. Any matriculated student who is repeating a course for the first time shall be allowed to register for the course during the Advance Registration period. Students who have received a grade of "W" will be treated as a first-time registrant for a course. The Office of the Registrar shall determine the date when students will be eligible to register for a course to be repeated, which will be no earlier than the conclusion of all registration appointments. The date will be noted in the Registration Calendar, as posted by the Office of the Registrar. Students who are repeating a class for two or more times shall submit a petition to the Registrar's Office.

Approved: April 23, 2018
Vote: 13-0-0
Present: Busick, Hospidales, Gill, Grindstaff (Non-voting), Khan, Kim, Kinney, Nash, Ng (Non-voting), Sen, Simpson, Sullivan-Green, Trousdale, Walters, Wilson
Financial impact: None
Workload impact: Unknown

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY AS 1701
Academic Senate
Curriculum and Research Committee
April 30, 2018
First Reading

Amendment A to University Policy S89-2

GRADUATE CREDIT FOR UNDERGRADUATES

Legislative History:

At its meeting of February 27, 1989, the Academic Senate approved the following Policy Recommendation presented by Sandra Kajiwara for the Curriculum Committee.

ACTION BY THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT:

"Approved and Accepted as University Policy. Effective immediately." Signed: Gail Fullerton, March 3, 1989.

Referral to Curriculum & Research Committee during AY 2016-2017 requesting 3+2 or 4+1 baccalaureate to master degree programs be reviewed by the committee. Executive Order 971 allows for blended baccalaureate and master's degrees.

~~GRADUATING SENIOR GRADUATE CREDIT~~

S 89-2

~~Resolved, That undergraduate students within the last 14 units of graduation shall be provided an opportunity to receive graduate credit for courses not to be used toward the baccalaureate degree (through petition to the Graduate Studies Office).~~

Whereas ***Students may wish to pursue graduate coursework before completing their baccalaureate degree, and***

Whereas ***Coded Memorandum AA-2012-01 allows for "Blended" or "4+1" Bachelor's and Master's Degree Programs, and***

Whereas ***EO 971 allows for blended baccalaureate and master degree awards, therefore be it***

~~Resolved, That undergraduate students within the last 14 units of graduation shall be provided an opportunity to receive graduate credit for courses not to be used toward the baccalaureate degree (through petition to the Graduate Studies Office).~~

Resolved, That undergraduate students within ***30*** units of graduation from ***San José State University*** shall be provided an opportunity to receive graduate

credit for courses not to be used toward the baccalaureate degree, and be it further

Resolved, That for students to receive graduate credit the following criteria apply:

~~1. No more than 14 units are needed to complete the baccalaureate degree at San Jose State University;~~

~~2~~. 1. None of the courses ~~to be~~ taken for graduate credit ~~is~~ ***are*** required for the baccalaureate degree;

~~3~~. 2. Grade point average is 2.5 or better *(or additional requirements as specified by the department)* on all work completed in upper division standing at San José State University; and be it further

~~4. A maximum of 15 units is attempted in the semester in which the courses for graduate credit are proposed; and~~

~~5. Graduation check has been completed.~~

Resolved, That the student may not elect to take letter-graded courses as CR/NC when graduate credit is requested, and be it further

Resolved, That graduate credit will appear on the student's official transcript, but that credit does not imply admission to any graduate degree program, and be it further

Resolved, That if a student is admitted to a graduate degree program, a maximum of ~~6~~ *9* units of graduate credit earned through the process described herein may be applied toward the master's degree when approved by the appropriate program authority, and be it further

Resolved, That students in a blended program shall be awarded graduate credit according to coded memorandum AA-2012-01

Approved:	April 25, 2018
Vote:	11-0-1
Present:	Anagnos, Bacich, Buzanski, Cargill, Chung, Heil, Jensen, Matoush, Rodan, Schultz-Krohn, Stacks, Trulio
Absent:	De Guzman
Workload Impact:	Potential increased workload for departments offering blended or 4+1 programs to provide advisement to students enrolled in this option.
Financial Impact:	None anticipated

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY AS 1702
Academic Senate
Curriculum and Research Committee
April 30, 2018
First Reading

POLICY RECOMMENDATION
Rescinds S67-31
Standards for Awarding Academic Credit: Faculty Appointment at SJSU; Discipline Specific Expertise of Faculty; Catalog Publication of Course

Legislative History: S67-31 was adopted as of September 8, 1967 to identify criteria to award academic credit for courses offered outside the regular college program. This policy indicates "the course must be taught by an officially appointed member of the College faculty".

Rationale: This policy does not provide clear guidance on standards for awarding academic credit and nor does it speak to the process used in the appointment of a faculty member to SJSU. The policy title does not accurately reflect the content in this policy. Furthermore, subsequent policies have addressed the content identified in the title.

Whereas: The historical need that dictated processes defining courses for academic credit no longer exists, and

Whereas: Faculty appointments are defined by contract and policies S10-7 and S15-6, therefore be it

Resolved: Rescind S67-31.

Approved:	April 25, 2018
Vote:	12-0-0
Present:	Anagnos, Bacich, Buzanski, Cargill, Chung, Heil, Jensen, Matoush, Rodan, Schultz-Krohn, Stacks, Trulio
Absent:	De Guzman
Workload Impact:	None anticipated
Financial Impact:	None anticipated