**SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE**

**2016/2017**

**Agenda**

**May 1, 2017, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm**

**Engineering 285/287**

**I. Call to Order and Roll Call:**

**II. Approval of Minutes:**

**Senate Minutes of April 10, 2017**

**III. Communications and Questions:**

A. From the Chair of the Senate

B. From the President

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

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

**V. Executive Committee Report:**

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee –

**Executive Committee Minutes of April 3, 2017**

B. Consent Calendar – None

C. Executive Committee Action Items –

**VI. New Business:**

**VII. Unfinished Business:**

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

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

B. University Library Board (ULB):

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

***AS 1651, Policy Recommendation, Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity: Advisor-Student Relationship, Sponsored Projects, and Proprietary RSCA and Issues of Confidentiality (Final Reading)***

***AS 1652, Policy Recommendation, Organization of the Program Planning Process at San José State University (First Reading)***

***AS 1653, Policy Recommendation, SJSU Graduate and Undergraduate University Learning Goals (First Reading)***

D. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
***AS 1649, Policy Recommendation, Registration Priority (Final Reading)***

E. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
***AS 1646, Policy Recommendation, Selection and Review of Department Chairs (Final Reading)***

**IX. Special Committee Reports:**
**Faculty Recruitment Update** by the AVP of Faculty Affairs, Senator Elna Green, **Time Certain: 2:45 p.m**.

**Athletics and FAR Presentation** by Professor Annette Nellen, Co-Chair of the Athletics Board, Eileen Daley, Sr. Associated Athletics Director, Jacquelyn Duysen, Director of Compliance, and the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR), Sen Chiao, **Time Certain: 4:00 p.m.**

**X. Adjournment:**

## 2016/2017 Academic Senate

## MINUTES
## April 10, 2017

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

**Ex Officio:**
Present: Kimbarow, Van Selst, Lee, Sabalius, Perea

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

**Deans:**
Present: Stacks, Jacobs, Green, Schutten

**Students:**
Present: Spica, Tran, Torres-Mendoza
Absent: Balal, Caesar

**Alumni Representative:**
Present: Walters
Absent: None

**Emeritus Representative:**
Present: Buzanski
Absent: None

**Honorary Representative:**
Absent: Lessow-Hurley

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

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

**COB Representatives:**
Present: Reade, Rodan
Absent: Campsey

**EDUC Representatives**:
Present: Mathur, Laker

**ENGR Representatives:**
Present: Chung, Hamedi-Hagh

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

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

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

## II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

The minutes of March 13, 2017 were approved as written (45-0-0).

## III. Communications and Questions –

### A. From the Chair of the Senate—

Chair Kimbarow announced that the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR) is holding a Freedom Forum on April 12, 2017 in MLK 225 from noon to 1:30 p.m. Senators were encouraged to attend.

The President's Inauguration Ceremony occurs on May 4, 2017 at 9:30 a.m. on Tower Lawn. Regalia for faculty is being paid for by the university.

Chair Kimbarow reminded Senators that the new Senate takes over on May 15, 2017 and he urged Senators to consider running for one of the Senate Officer positions. The election for these seats will be on May 15, 2017 from 4 p.m. to 5 p.m. during the first meeting of the 2017-2018 Academic Senate.

**B. From the President—**

President Papazian spent last week with our Alumni Team in New York and Washington D.C. These were some pretty extraordinary alums. It was great to see that kind of Spartan pride clear across the country.

President Papazian is aware that some people are still concerned about safety issues. The President made a pledge in the fall that she would share incidents with the campus and has kept that pledge. The campus has issued more alerts, and VP Faas continues to work on implementing the safety plan. However, we need to be aware of our surroundings and we all need to work together.

The President encouraged Senators to attend the Inauguration and to participate in the events that lead up to it. It is a great celebration that represents the values we all share.

The President urged Senators to wear their regalia at commencement. Commencement is really about the students. The students care about the faculty that impacted their lives and want to see them at the ceremony. The President asked why Commencement is on Memorial Day weekend and no one knew why. The President asked if anyone wanted it on Memorial Day weekend and no one wanted it on that weekend. The President said she would be looking into changing the date of the event. The President will also be looking into condensing the activities surrounding Commencement. Right now it takes a month to six weeks and that is really drawn out. The President will look about how we can do it in a way to honor the university, but also allow students to walk across the stage and be recognized.

President Papazian will be leaving a little early today in order to meet with the Mayor. They will be go over some things such as the Farmer's Program and how San José State could be involved in that in terms of providing pipelines for San José students. They will also be talking about the library and some of the ways the library could be reorganized to have space for the public and students.

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

**A. Vice President of Finance and Administration – No report.**

**Questions:**

**Q:** There are labels on all the furniture in the hallways in Clark Hall again for removal. I thought that had been resolved.

**A:** The Fire Marshal has inspected and for safety reasons we cannot have benches in the hallways. We are looking for ways to address the needs of faculty that have students wait a while to see them. On the fourth floor there are some areas where

seating is possible and FD&O is working on that.

**B. Vice President for Student Affairs – Not present.**

**C. Associated Students President –**
On March 1, 2017 students had a walkout to protest the tuition increase. On March 21, 2017 a smaller group of students again had a walkout to protest the tuition increase, and then went to Long Beach, CA to the Board of Trustees meeting. Students are really looking for a sustainable model for free public education similar to what is being done in New York. It is not that students want to decrease the quality of education. Students just want to work for free public education. Sometimes there are some misunderstandings between students and faculty about these issues, but the biggest push is to get free public education for all.

From 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. today (April 10, 2017) AS is having debates for the incoming student government. Right after that voting will commence and close on April 13, 2017 at 8 a.m. The new board will be announced at noon on April 13, 2017.

The Spartan Showcase will be held on April 19, 2017 in the Student Union. This event will showcase all the work done by student organizations that receive funding through student fees.

AS has $82,000 in scholarships to award and applications will close on May 1, 2017.

AS will be hosting a "Diversity Day" on April 27, 2017 from noon to 3 p.m. in the 7th Street Plaza.

On May 2, 2017, AS will send a few students to Sacramento to lobby against student tuition increases and also lobby for increased funding.

Other than these things, the AS Board is focusing on transitioning in the new Board of Directors.

**Questions:**
A member requested that Chair Kimbarow forward Senators the information on the AS Scholarships when he sends the recap of events from this Senate meeting out to all faculty. That way faculty can share with their students.

**D. Chief Diversity Officer (CDO) –** No report.

**E. CSU Statewide Senators –**
The Academic Senate California State University (ASCSU) met on March 16-17, 2017. Several resolutions were passed including a request that we stop using

equivalencies for Intermediate Algebra, support for the $48 fix reclaiming California's Master Plan for Higher Education, support for graduate education in the CSU, and support for CSU Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) students. The ASCSU also adopted positions on numerous legislative actions. The ASCSU also passed a resolution opposing President Trump's Executive Orders on travel.

The final thing discussed was the Chancellor's Office policy on Intellectual Property. There was a lot of consternation and concern from the faculty on the ASCSU. The ASCSU and campuses were given a 60-day deadline for responses to the proposed policy. The ASCSU was able to get a two-week extension to that so responses are due in 74 days. According to the Chancellor's Office, Intellectual Property is something that is subject to bargaining only and faculty should not have input into it unless they are sitting at the bargaining table. The ASCSU doesn't quite feel that way about it. Senator Lee highly recommends that all Senators read the proposed Intellectual Property policy.

**F. Provost –** No report.

**V. Executive Committee Report –**

**A. Executive Committee Minutes –**

EC Minutes of March 6, 2017 –
EC Minutes of March 20, 2017 –

Senator Van Selst commented that the minutes were a little sparse. Chair Kimbarow said he would look into it. [Senator Van Selst mistook the agenda for the minutes.]

Senator Buzanski expressed concern about the second paragraph from the end of page 1 on the March 20, 2017 minutes. There is a statement that says, "This is where a new VP of Research and Innovation position could be very helpful in moving along these type of issues." In the last 20 years, the number of top level administrators has increased phenomenally while at the same time the ratio of faculty to FTEF has declined. In other words, fewer faculty are teaching more students than ever before. There are many good arguments on behalf of why we have administrators, but the question is whether some monetary savings might be accomplished by having lower level MPPs handle some of these things. President Papazian responded that we have struggled to maintain the numbers of faculty we need to have. It isn't a matter of one or the other, faculty or administrators. The President is 100% committed to increasing the faculty. However, we need to be thoughtful and strategic and really look at whether a position is really needed. Perhaps if we were in a different location this position wouldn't be needed, but we are in Silicon Valley and surrounded by global business and industry and world class research is going on. If we decide to go in this direction it will be because there is a strategic benefit for that particular position.

Senator Rodan asked if it would be possible to have consultation with faculty before

these positions are created instead of afterward? President Papazian responded that consultation had already begun with faculty on the Executive Committee. However, positions are a management decision to achieve certain ends and there has to be accountability etc. When it is a position that has tremendous synergy with faculty it is only wise to get faculty input. The President is having these conversations and will continue to have them with the Executive Committee and faculty, but ultimately she must make the decision on how to structure the university to achieve our goals. President Papazian commented that SJSU is quite lean when it comes to the numbers of MPPs as compared to other institutions, but we are a campus of 35,000 students and the second largest research enterprise in the CSU so we must make sure that is supported, because there are implications if you don't treat that right in terms of federal law and expectations. Senator Peter suggested that what might be helpful is to see the statistics comparing our MPPs to our faculty numbers.

**B. Consent Calendar –**

There was no dissent to the consent calendar of March 13, 2017.

**C. Executive Committee Action Items:** None

**VI. New Business –** None

**VII. Unfinished Business:** None

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

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

Senator Mathur presented ***AS 1651, Policy Recommendation, Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA): Advisor-Student Relationship, Sponsored Projects, and proprietary RSCA and Issues of Confidentiality (First Reading).***

In reviewing S94-8, which is our current 23-year-old policy on RSCA, we noted that many provisions of the policy are outdated. There are three main areas where the policy is outdated. First, the sources of funding that are delineated in S94-8 are no longer available, have been renamed, or have been allocated to different offices or funding streams. For example, assigned time is collectively bargained and offered through the Office of Faculty Affairs and really can't be modified through university policy. The second area where the policy is outdated is the regulations responsible for research that have changed. The third area changed is propriety research and this section needs to be expanded to include additional information and guidelines.

In revising the policy, the C&R Committee consulted with the Campus RSCA Advisory Committee, the Office of Research, the UCCD, the Deans and Associate Deans, the Office of the Provost, and University Counsel. C&R received a lot of feedback and all of it was considered.

**Questions:**
**Q:** On line 211, it specifies that the Principal Investigator will be responsible for ensuring all the university forms, and certifications are completed in a timely manner. Would the committee consider drawing out the requirement that the Principal Investigator have their IRB/Human Subjects certification current and say that explicitly?
**A:** You must have the certification before the study can be submitted right now, but the committee will consider being more specific.

**Q:** Since these students are in a subordinate position, how do they know what recourse they might have if there is an issue?
**A:** The university does have a standard process for students if they have grievances or issues by going through the Student Fairness Committee. When we onboard new faculty that could be an opportunity for faculty to provide students they will be working with this kind of direct information, and we could also encourage the Office of Research to do more outreach to these students to ensure they know what avenues are available to them.

**Q:** Our current policies restrict confidential research, and I don't see the same restrictions in this policy. The nondisclosure agreement (NDA) component describes what nondisclosure agreements are and when they are appropriate, but I'm not seeing when they aren't appropriate.
**A:** In developing this section, we closely consulted current university policy S69-12, which talks about classified research. Within that older policy, the distinction between classified and confidential is not clear. We wanted to maintain the prohibitions for classified research, but delineate it from confidential and proprietary research. The university itself does not have any prohibitions against confidential research other than as outlined in the current university policy. However, we do have some prohibitions regarding proprietary research which is where the NDAs come into play. We carefully consulted with university counsel and we wanted to be as open as possible about how NDAs could be used, but we weren't sure it would be valuable for faculty to say how they can't be used because those might change over time.

**Q:** Would the committee consider making the second paragraph under I.B. the first paragraph and turning the first paragraph into principles?
**A:** The committee will consider it.

**B. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) –**
Senator Miller presented ***AS 1648, Policy Recommendation, Graduate Student Revalidation of Courses that Exceed the 7-year Limit (Final Reading).***
Senator Frazier presented an amendment to strike, "It must not necessarily though require recollection of all of the material in the original class;". And to move, "; thus, administering an exam similar to the original final exam would not be warranted" to line 73 starting after "material." Senator Rodan presented an amendment to the Frazier Amendment to change, "; thus, administering an exam similar..." to read, "; thus, administering an exam not necessarily similar...". **The Senate voted and the Rodan**

**Amendment to the Frazier Amendment passed (31-2-6). The Senate voted and the Frazier/Rodan Amendment passed (24-7-5).** Senator Mathur presented an amendment to strike lines 62 and 63 which reads, "The exam must be a rigorous one, invariably requiring studying on the part of the student." The Senate voted and the Mathur Amendment failed (1-33-2). **Senator Van Selst presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to add "appropriately" before "rigorous" to the end of line 62**. Senator J. Lee presented an amendment to strike the word "seminar" in line 77. **The Senate voted and the Lee Amendment passed (24-8-5)**. **The Senate voted and AS 1648 passed as amended (36-0-1).**

---

Senator Miller presented ***AS 1649, Policy Recommendation, Registration Priority Policy (also Amendment A to University Policy S73-4) (First Reading).***
This policy reconfiguration is largely a function of needing to address the new California promise. If you look on page 4 under rationale it gives details of Senate Bill 412, which defines the California Promise Program and legislates the requirement of priority registration for California Promise students. In terms of this policy, not much else has changed from the original policy, F14-1. There are a couple of other changes under section 2.0. Honors on acceptance and EOP students have been removed from the priority registration categories in section 2.0. There were so many students receiving honors on acceptance that it did not mean anything any longer. EOP students are registered during orientation now, so there is no need to give them priority registration.

**Questions:**
**Q:** What are coordinators and who are they?
**A:** Good question, the committee will define what this is.

**Q:** In section 3.4 it says the Student Success Committee will determine which category each applicant group qualifies for and shall notify the coordinator of the group on the granting, extending, or denying of priority registration. It seems that the policy lays this out so why do you need a group to explicitly do something that is laid out in policy?
**A:** The committee will consider this.

**Q:** Would the committee consider changing Frosh to Freshmen?
**A:** The committee will consider this.

**Q:** On line 68 could you clarify where the ROTC falls in priority registration, because they are not technically veterans?
**A:** The committee will clarify.

---

Senator Miller presented ***AS 1650, Policy Recommendation, Codification and Revision of Undergraduate Student Honors (First Reading).***
The first change in this policy has to do with when we are determining semester honors. The current process is somewhat elaborate. A student can earn honors if they receive it in two out of three semesters. This poses a few challenges. It is complicated for our administrative offices, but also the committee felt Freshmen that are doing well should be able to get honors and they cannot if they have to wait three semesters. The other

major change is that the committee has removed honors on entrance due to the number of students that were receiving it. Again, there was a feeling in the committee that honors should be based on how students are doing here and not how they were doing before they arrived here. Then there was the creation in 4.0 of a new category of honors, which is honors in a special course sequence. This is an opportunity for our students in an honors program to earn honors, and also for students that take a sequence of courses that might be across departments. Also, Summa Cum Laude has been changed to a 3.9 gpa or above. That brings our numbers more in line with other institutions.

**Questions:**
**Q:** I think the sequence is a much needed addition. On line 206 it states that the SCS honors status will be shown on the transcript with a notation explaining what the designation means, so has the committee confirmed that the Registrar can actually put that designation on the transcript, and where will it be located on the transcript?
**A:** The committee will consider this. The Registrar is on the committee, so we will ask her.

**Q:** Regarding the President's Scholar and Dean's Scholar has there been any analysis of how many more students will be earning the Dean's and President's Scholar designations? The second question is with regards to the changes to the latin honors, does the designation happen when the student graduates, or will it occur when they earn the designation?
**A:** We do think there will be some increase in the Dean's and President's Scholar designation. The committee felt this was offset by the need to recognize Freshmen that achieve honors. As to your second question, I don't know about the latin designation, but I will bring this back to the committee.

**Q:** With the removal of the honors at entrance, those students that were invited into the university honors program based on having honors at entrance won't have that designation any longer, so how will that work?
**A:** It would seem to me that the same process for identifying the honors at entrance students could be used to identify those students to be invited into our honors program.

**Q:** Could the special course sequences possibly be course sequences being developed in the general education area as well as outside general education?
**A:** The committee wanted to create the opportunity to be honored, but wanted to leave the course details to be worked out. We felt this was more the purview of the curriculum committee.

**Q:** There are a couple of issues that I am troubled by. Pertaining to line 63 it says a minimum of 12 semester units, so this excludes anyone that isn't taking a full load from any kind of honors. I'm not sure this is fair. Also, regarding line 68—report delayed, what if the report is delayed because the faculty member hasn't entered the grades on time and the student is penalized? I wanted to get a sense of how the Senate feels about this.

**A:** The report delayed is something the committee struggled with. There has to be a cutoff point to make that happen. We had important conversations regarding both issues, so it would be helpful if Senators send feedback to the committee.

**C. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –**

Senator Peter presented ***AS 1530, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Requesting Changes in the System Wide Proposed Intellectual Property Policy (Final Reading).*** **Senator Peter presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to strike the word "a" before the word "one" on line 336**. **The Senate voted and AS 1646 passed as amended (35-0-0)**.

---

Senator Peter presented ***AS 1647, Policy Recommendation, Rescinding and Replacing F97-7 on Privacy of Electronic Information (Final Reading).***
Senator Torres-Mendoza presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change the "e" in "Jose" to "é" in section 1.5, first line. **The Senate voted and AS 1647 was approved as amended (36-0-1).**

---

Senator Peter presented ***AS 1646, Policy Recommendation, Selection and Review of Department Chairs (Final Reading).***
Senator Peter made a motion to return the resolution to committee due to receiving 11 amendments from the deans this afternoon**.** **The Senate voted and the motion passed (35-0-1)**.

---

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

Senator Shifflett presented ***AS 1635, Policy Recommendation, Selection and Review of Administrators (Final Reading***). **Senator Frazier presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to to add ", ideally a faculty member," after "committee chair" in lines 100, 171, and 224. Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to strike "goals and recommendations arising from prior performance reviews (when such has occurred)," in line 391; to strike "(a)" in line 400; to strike, ", which can include performance goals set by the appropriate administrator and (b) appraisals of performance" after the words "appropriate information" on lines 400, 401, and 402.** Senator Tran presented an amendment to strike, "This could include the appointment of up to two additional members while maintaining the requirement that a majority of members be faculty" on lines 162-164. The Senate voted and the Tran Amendment failed (2-32-2). **The Senate voted and AS 1635 passed as amended (31-3-3).**

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

**IX. Special Committee Reports --** None.

**X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.**

**Executive Committee Meeting**
**April 3, 2017**
**12-1:30, ADM 167**

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

Absent: Papazian, Blaylock

1. The minutes of March 20, 2017 were approved (12-0-0).

2. There was no dissent to the consent calendar of April 3, 2017.

3. Updates:

   a. **From the Provost:**
   The Dean of the College of Education Search is underway. The committee hopes to have three or four finalists visit the campus in the next couple of weeks. The committee's recommendation will then be sent to the Provost by the first week of May 2017.

   The Provost will announce the Interim Dean of the College of Humanities and the Arts at the end of April 2017. The Provost hopes to have a draft of the position description approved by July 1, 2017, and have the search sent out to the search firm over the summer. The new dean should be on board by early Spring or July 1, 2018 at the latest.

   b. **From the Vice President of Administration and Finance (VPAF):**
   The VPAF is still looking for a suitable AVP of FDO. There have been four failed search attempts. They thought they had a suitable candidate recently, but it did not work out. However, the VPAF has reached out to his contacts in the local community and has two viable candidates that he will be contacting.

   The VPAF will be starting a search in June for a replacement for Josee Larochelle. He will be focusing on someone with strong CSU experience.

   The President's blog has an article that the VPAF wrote regarding BART.

   c. **From the CDO:**
   The CDO recently attended a National Chief Diversity Officer's Conference.

   Incoming Freshmen are receiving 2 hours of Diversity training during Freshmen Orientation that includes Title IX and Diversity Issues. Leadership and Survival Training is also a big benefit to students during orientation.

   d. **From the AS President:**
   Many students and AS Directors went to the March 21, 2017 Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting to protect the proposed tuition increases. Nevertheless, the BOT passed the tuition increase. The next step for AS is to lobby Sacramento.

   There will be student debates for the AS President and Board of Director seats after the Senate meeting on April 10, 2017.

Admitted Spartans Day is April 8, 2017.

AS will be hosting a Diversity Day on the 7th Street Plaza on April 27, 2017 from noon to 3 p.m.

e. **From the CSU Statewide Senate:**
There is a new Executive Order pertaining to Special Session classes.

The ASCSU has not issued their Sense of the Senate Resolution yet on Intellectual Property. The deadline was extended by two weeks.

At the ASCSU meeting Zoom flat lined. The committee discussed being tied to WebX and not Zoom. If you are initiating a call you must pay for it with Zoom. The Provost will look into this.

f. **From the Organization and Government Committee (O&G):**
O&G will bring the Selection and Review of Administrators policy for a final reading at the April 10, 2017 meeting.

g. **From the Professional Standards Committee (PS):**
PS will bring the Selection of Chairs and Directors policy for a final reading at the April 10, 2017 meeting. Under the old policy the chair search had to fail in order for a department to to request an external chair search. This has been changed under the new policy to allow the department to ask the Dean for an external search at the onset.

h. **From the Chair of the Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):**
C&R will bring a policy resolution on Research Scholarship and Creative Activity (RSCA) to the April 10, 2017 Senate meeting.

C&R has closed the referral to allow Graduate Students to be exempt from requiring the WST as a prerequisite for 100W. The committee determined a policy was not needed, and that GUP can make this exemption procedurally.

C&R is also working on a draft department name change policy.

C&R has run into a "hiccup" regarding the Internship Policy having to do with Safeclip-Student Liability Insurance.

i. **From the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):**
I&SA will be bringing the Priority Registration and Honors Policies to the Senate at the April 10, 2017 meeting.

4. State Fire Inspection:
The state fire inspection has raised some issues and concerns. Some buildings have benches in areas that are not allowed and they will have to be removed. Safety is our priority.

5. Intellectual Property:

   The CSU proposes to replace all campus policies on Intellectual Property with one CSU policy. We were given 60 days to provide comments and feedback. That deadline was extended two additional weeks. The UC policy on Intellectual Property is much better than the CSU version. There are issues with regard to content and process. The CSU policy appears to allow the CSU to claim ownership of curricular material. The PS Committee will draft a resolution for the April 10, 2017 Senate meeting.

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

These minutes were taken and transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice on April 11, 2017. The minutes were edited by Chair Kimbarow on April 11, 2017. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on April 17, 2017.

**SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY**
**Academic Senate**
**Professional Standards Committee**
**May 1, 2017** **AS 1646**
**Final Reading**

# Policy Recommendation
# Selection and Review of Department Chairs and Directors

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

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

Approved: April 24, 2017

Vote: 8-0-0

Present: Peter, Green, White, Lee, Reade, Caesar, Hamedi-Hagh, Caesar

Absent: Kauppila, Hwang

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

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

# POLICY RECOMMENDATION
# Selection and Review of Department Chairs and Directors

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. Preamble

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

### 1.2. Definitions

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

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

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

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

## 2. QUALIFICATIONS

Chairs should preferably be Professors but may be Associates, and should have earned rank and tenure prior to the time the appointment to Chair would become

effective. Exceptions should only be made in rare instances and for compelling reasons.

## 3. DEPARTMENT NOMINATING PROCESS

Every four years, the department faculty shall identify a nominee for Department Chair by secret ballot vote following these procedures. These are also the procedures for departments to recommend candidates for role as acting Chair (in section 10 below.)

3.1. Deans and departments should communicate about transitions as early as possible to allow for a collegial and orderly process. The Chair's job description—which should include the fraction of assigned time to be provided to the Chair--should be developed by the Dean in consultation with the Department.

3.2. College Election Committee. The College will create a College Election Committee that will consist of three individuals: 1) The Dean or the Dean's designee, 2) a member of the College RTP committee (chosen by the committee from a department other than the one holding the nomination election), and 3) one tenured faculty member from the department (chosen by the department tenured and tenure track faculty from among those department faculty who are not candidates.)

3.3. Responsibilities of the College Election Committee. The College Election Committee shall see that the department is informed of the requirements of this policy, shall (with the help of Faculty Affairs) interpret and explain the policy to the department when questions arise, shall count and certify the votes, and shall see that the results are delivered to the President and to the Department in the appropriate formats.

3.4. Charging the Department. The Dean (or, at the Dean's option, the College Election Committee) should attend a Department meeting at the beginning of the nomination process to provide this policy and the Chair's job description and fraction of assigned time, and to explain the process for nominating a Chair. All persons who are not members of the Department should depart before deliberations begin, unless specifically invited to remain by the majority vote of the faculty present.

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

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

department should proceed with the normal process to nominate a department Chair.

3.7. Faculty may suggest names to appear on the ballot for the nominating election. Nominated persons shall accept or decline nomination. Candidates will be given the opportunity to make statements and take questions from department faculty.

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

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

3.8.2. If there are two or more candidates, balloting will provide a choice between the candidates and a choice “do not recommend any candidate.”

3.8.3. If an election with three or more candidates fails to produce a majority for any candidate, there shall be a second round of balloting between those two candidates who received the most votes in the first round.

3.9. Counting the votes. The college election committee will meet to count votes. The candidates will be notified of the time and place of the count at least one day in advance, and each may send one observer (other than themselves). The committee is responsible for an accurate count and review of ballots. The committee will assure that balloting was secret, that votes are entered in the correct category, and that proper proportions are applied. The results shall be certified (signed) by the election committee.

3.10. Forwarding the results of the nominating election. Only the name of a candidate who receives a majority of votes cast by the tenured and probationary faculty shall be recommended to the President via the College Dean as the nominee of the department.[1] The names of candidates who were not recommended by the department, together with all vote totals, shall also be forwarded to the President to provide context for the recommendation. This shall include a statement of the vote of all faculty, broken down into two categories – vote by tenured/tenure track faculty and by lecturers -- including the actual number of votes cast in each category. If the final vote total from part-time faculty contains a fraction, it shall be rounded to help preserve anonymity.

3.11. Distributing the results. The department voting results shall also be distributed to the faculty from the relevant department.

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

[1] See CFA/CSU Agreement 20.30.

## 4. EXTERNAL SEARCHES

4.1. Request for an external search. An external search is a search in which candidates from outside San Jose State University are invited to apply to be hired as a tenured faculty member and as department Chair. Department faculty may request an external search for department chair. A department request for an external search should take the form of a majority vote of the department (following normal procedures for department voting rights). Such requests are not automatically granted.

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

4.2.1. Departments may designate all tenured and tenure track faculty as a recruitment committee “of the whole” so that the appointment recommendation and the nomination recommendation are coterminous. When this method is chosen, the committee of the whole must provide lecturers with the opportunity to provide confidential feedback on the search prior to final recommendations. A department may only use this method when there are more tenured faculty than probationary faculty. If it chooses this method, the normal prohibition of faculty serving on a personnel committee evaluating faculty of higher rank is suspended.

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

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

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

5. APPOINTMENT

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

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

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

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

Departments may be unable to successfully conclude a normal nomination for Department Chair. This could be the case in a department with no senior leadership qualified to be Chair, or no willing candidates. If a department fails to reach consensus (majority vote of the tenured and probationary faculty) following a normal nomination process (Section 3), the Dean shall consult with the faculty at a department meeting to determine the best course of action. This could be either the nomination of an interim or acting Chair, initiation of an external search, extension of a prior interim appointment, or nomination of a non-departmental interim Chair-- as per the relevant sections of this policy.

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

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

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

6.4. Extended interim Chairs. The extension of an interim appointment beyond one year may endanger the principles of collegial governance and should be avoided if possible. If this occurs the Organization and Government Committee of the Academic Senate shall inquire into the reasons for the situation and report its recommendations to the Senate and the President.

## 7. REVIEW OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

7.1. Timing of Normal Review: The Dean shall initiate the formal review of each Department Chair during the fourth year of an incumbent's term, unless the incumbent states that he/she will not be a candidate to continue as Chair beyond the fourth year.

7.2. Early Review: Department faculty may initiate a formal review of the Department Chair by submitting a petition to the Dean, provided that at least one academic year has passed since the Chair's appointment or previous review. The petition shall state simply that "The undersigned faculty call for a prompt review of our Department Chair." If the petition is signed by department faculty totaling more than 50% of the department electorate, the College Dean will initiate a formal review of the Department Chair. The petition should preferably be delivered early enough to permit the review to be completed before the end of the current semester, but an early review should always be completed within 40 duty days from receipt of the petition. To determine if the petition exceeds the 50% threshold, the signatures of both tenure/tenure track faculty and lecturers will be counted, with the signatures of lecturers weighted according to the proportion of their appointment. The Dean will announce the number of signatures and whether the petition exceeds the threshold, but will keep the petition itself and the signed names confidential from the incumbent chair.

7.3. Appointment and Composition of Review Committee: At the beginning of the fourth year of the Department Chair's term, under the direction of the College Dean, the tenured and tenure-track department faculty shall elect from its ranks a peer review committee to evaluate the Department Chair's performance[2]. The review committee, in consultation with the College Dean, will determine the procedures and scope of the review.

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

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

[2] See CFA/CSU Agreement Article 15

the deliberations and reports of such committees, and any accompanying materials, shall be confidential.

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 8. REAPPOINTMENT OF A DEPARTMENT CHAIR

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

## 9. SELECTION OF AN INTERIM CHAIR

An interim appointment occurs when a Department Chair’s position has or will be vacated and there is insufficient time or it is otherwise impractical to complete the regular nomination process explained in Section I (Nominations). The interim Chair serves only as long as required to complete the appointment of a regularly appointed chair.

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

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

9.3. Transition to a regularly appointed Chair. While overseeing all the complex tasks of the department, the interim Chair's ultimate responsibility is to prepare the department for an orderly transition to a regularly appointed Chair. The interim Chair should serve until a regularly appointed Chair takes office, normally before the beginning of the next academic year when taking office in the summer or Fall, or by the beginning of the following Spring semester when taking office in the Spring. If the department cannot transition to a regularly appointed Chair within one year, the situation should be resolved under section 6 (Failure to Obtain) of this policy.

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

## 10. SELECTION OF AN ACTING CHAIR

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

10.1. Planned need for acting Chair. When the short-term absence of a Chair can be anticipated, the Department should nominate an Acting Chair using the procedures outlined in section 3 (normal nomination.)

10.2. Sudden need for acting Chair. When there is insufficient time or it is otherwise impractical to complete the regular nomination process explained in section 3, an Acting Chair should be designated using the procedures outlined in section 9 (interim.)

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

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

## 11. REMOVAL OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR

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

11.1. Administrative removal. The administrative removal of a Chair previously recommended by the faculty of a department is a very serious matter, and should only be undertaken for compelling reasons. A Chair will be given an opportunity to meet with the Provost and Dean to defend his/her record prior to removal. Following removal, the President or Provost

should meet with the Dean and the faculty assembled in a department meeting to announce the action and solicit advice on the transition. Replacement of the Chair should be initiated according to the procedures in sections 3 or 9 of this policy.

11.2. Faculty initiated removal. Faculty may not initiate the removal of their Chair unless a formal review has been completed within the previous six months. (They may initiate such a review as per 7.2 of this policy.) Following the conclusion of any faculty-initiated early review, the department will vote to determine if their Chair should be recalled. A recall vote will follow the same procedures as a vote to recommend a Chair nominee as described in section 3 of this policy, save only that it requires a vote of 2/3 of the tenure/tenure track faculty to forward a recommendation to the President that the Chair be removed, with the votes of lecturers also reported as per the above procedures. If removed, replacement of the Chair should be initiated according to the procedures in sections 3 or 9 of this policy.

**San Jose State University**
**Academic Senate**
**Instruction & Student Affairs Committee** **AS 1649**
**May 1, 2017**
**Final Reading**

# Policy Recommendation
# Registration Priority

**Legislative History**: Rescinds F14-1, Amends Section 2 of S73-4

Resolved:

1.0 **Scheduling of Registration**

Students shall be allowed to register in the following order:

- Group 1: Specific Priority Categories (see 2.0 below)
- Group 2a: Graduating seniors (those who have a graduation application on file with an anticipated graduation date for the current or next semester) in the California Promise program
- Group 2b: Remaining graduating students (bachelors- and graduate-level students who have a graduation application on file with an anticipated graduation date for the current or next semester)
- Group 3: Graduate students
- Group 4a: Seniors in the California Promise program
- Group 4b: Remaining seniors
- Group 5: Second baccalaureate students
- Group 6a: Juniors in the California Promise program
- Group 6b: Remaining juniors
- Group 7a: Sophomores and continuing frosh in the California Promise program
- Group 7b: Remaining sophomores and continuing frosh

Students in Groups 2-7 will register on the basis of rotating alphabetical cycles within each group.
Note: First time frosh registration is based on orientation. Incoming transfer students have a registration date dependent on when they matriculate.

2.0 **Categories of Group 1: Specific Priority Students**

2.1 Category A:

- Students who are required by external agencies such as the National Collegiate Athletic Association, or by law, to receive priority. This excludes students covered by SB 412 , the California Promise program unless they also fall under another group with required priority

registration. Priority registration for students in the California Promise program is addressed in the regular registration as outlined in Section 1.0.

- Students whose contributions to the university are recognized as being so extensive that their graduation would be postponed by the amount of time spent on their extracurricular duties.
- Students serving on Senate committees that require student participation in order to perform essential functions.
- Students who are part of any group that has a contractual agreement with SJSU to provide a full course load.

Groups in this category include

- Accessible Education Center (AEC) students
- AEC note takers
- Associated Students Board of Directors
- Student Fairness Committee members
- NCAA Athletics
- Guardian Scholars
- Reciprocal Exchange students
- Veterans (as per Cal. Educ. Code §66025.8)

This category does not require regular review by the Student Success Committee, though review may be requested if/when circumstances change.

2.2 Category B:

Students who would not otherwise graduate within a reasonable period of time because they participate in an ongoing, university sanctioned activity that meets all of the following criteria:

- the activity significantly benefits the University;
- the activity has a regularly scheduled class, event or practice offered only at specific times that conflict with a vast majority of prime time classes that are offered (i.e. 9:00 – 3:00 Monday through Thursday) and cannot be moved outside of prime time;
- participation at every class, event or practice is mandatory; the sponsoring organization must establish a minimum GPA and progress to degree criteria and monitor it each semester; mandatory meetings must be set prior to the first day of the semester.

2.3 Category C:

Students enrolled in an integrated package of courses that meets all of the following criteria:

- covers at least four areas of the General Education Program

- involves being part of a cohort group of students from multiple colleges
- requires enrollment together in a specified course sequence over multiple semesters.

Priority registration will be granted to students in this category beginning with the second semester of enrollment.

2.4 Category D:

Students who are required by external scholarship granting agencies/donors to meet progress toward degree milestones that are more rigorous than those of the institution and/or whose benefits/eligibility to participate expire based on time limitations of less than 6 years.

3.0 **Implementation – Approval and Continuing Approval**

3.1 It is the intention that no more than 10% of the FTES of SJSU be available for priority registration under the policy.

3.2 The Accessible Education Center will review AEC students and note takers in Category A each semester and provide an updated list.

3.3 Coordinators of all groups in Category B, C, and D who wish to apply for priority registration on behalf of their group of students, including those that currently hold such status, shall apply to the Student Success Committee for continuation or granting of priority registration status.

Priority registration for groups of students in these categories normally shall be awarded for periods of up to five years. The Student Success Committee may authorize priority registration for a shorter time period, and when doing so, will provide written justification describing concerns.

In the case of an application for continuing approval, the coordinator of each currently approved group is responsible for resubmitting such an application at least one full semester prior to the expiration of the previous granting of priority registration.

In the case of an application for new approval, the coordinator of a group seeking such approval must submit an application at least one full semester prior to the requested implementation date.

3.4 The Student Success Committee shall determine which category each applicant group qualifies for and shall notify the coordinator of the group regarding the granting, extending, or denying of priority registration. The Chair of the Student Success Committee must receive applications for fall priority registration no later than April 1. The Chair of the Student Success Committee must receive applications for spring priority registration no later than September 1.

3.5 An increase of more than 10% of the original number of approved students approved for priority registration will automatically require a statement of justification submitted to the committee no later than April 1 for fall semester and no later than September 1 for spring semester registration. This requirement cannot apply to students participating in the California Promise as state law mandates this program.

**4.0 Submission of student names and SJSU ID Numbers to the Registrar's Office**

Submission of student names and SJSU ID numbers to the Registrar's Office for groups of students receiving priority registration is the responsibility of the coordinator of the group. Each coordinator is responsible for contacting the Registrar's Office for submission deadlines.

**Rationale:**

Senate Bill 412, passed on September 21, 2016, defines the California Promise program and legislates the requirement of priority registration for California Promise students. This program is available to frosh and to transfer students with an associate degree for transfer. It facilitates a four year graduation rate for frosh and a two year graduation are for transfers with commitments on the part of the university and the student. One such commitment on the university side is priority registration. There will be an increasingly larger percentage of students eligible for the California Promise program as SJSU works to meet our CSU Graduation 2025 goals of a 35% four year frosh graduation rate and 36% two year transfer graduation rate. This policy integrates the priority registration for students in the California Promise program into the registration for all students by class level in order to balance the requirement to give priority registration to students in the California Promise program with the need to maintain access to classes for all students.

| | |
|---|---|
| Approved: | April 3, 2017 |
| Vote: | 11-0-0 |
| Present: | Kaufman (Chair), Walters, Yao, Simpson, Miller, Wilson, Nash, Perea, Mendoza, Spica, Sen, Bruck (non-voting) |
| Financial impact: | None |
| Workload impact: | Initial work will be needed by enrollment services to adapt the registration process to account for students in California Promise program. Continued workload will be needed by the Office of Student and Faculty Success to ensure the list of students enrolled in the California Promise program are accurate. |

**San José State University**
**Academic Senate** **AS 1651**
**Curriculum and Research Committee**
**May 1, 2017**
**Final Reading**

# Policy Recommendation:
# Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity: Advisor-Student Relationship, Sponsored Projects, and Proprietary and Confidential Information in RSCA

## Legislative History: Rescinds S94-8

**Rationale:** There is need to update the University policy on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (hereafter RSCA) in compliance with the Integrated CSU Administrative Manual Section 11000. In addition, policies, procedures, and practices on campus have undergone significant changes in the last 20 years that necessitates an update to our RSCA policy.

RSCA at a university advances the frontiers of knowledge, keeps individuals energized and familiar with recent developments in their fields, and provides an experiential learning context for students. These activities enrich a university community, contribute to knowledge and progress in the profession, and contribute to high-quality education. San José State University (SJSU) endorses the principles of academic freedom in RSCA and the University promotes conditions of free inquiry as outlined in SJSU University Policy S99-8. As per S94-8, SJSU supports RSCA activity and the pursuit of research in concert with other university duties. All RSCA undertaken by SJSU personnel and students must be in compliance with all federal, state, CSU, and SJSU laws, regulations, and policies (contact Office of Research for guidance on laws, regulations, and policies). RSCA is defined by the discipline and may be further elaborated on within departments and colleges. RSCA typically excludes individual consulting or individual private business ventures.

**Whereas:** RSCA at SJSU includes a wide range of activities, funding approaches, disciplines, and practices, this policy covers only three aspects of RSCA: I. The RSCA Advisor - Student Relationship; II. Sponsored Projects; and III. Proprietary and Confidential Information in RSCA[1].

[1] See Table 1 for list of other University Policies relating to RSCA.

## I. The RSCA Advisor- Student Relationship

The involvement of students as active participants in RSCA projects provides students with richly rewarding, and often unique, learning opportunities, and the University encourages student involvement in RSCA. Thus, one of the criteria that may positively influence the decision to undertake RSCA projects or to accept extramural support is the potential to enrich quality of the student learning experience. The University thus adopts the following policy governing the RSCA Advisor - Student Relationship:

### A. RSCA Advisor Role

When bringing students into a RSCA project as collaborators, the advisor should encourage the free pursuit of learning, should show respect for the student as an individual, and act as an intellectual guide and advisor/mentor.

### B. Alignment of Commitments and Obligations

Prior to bringing a student into a RSCA project, the advisor and the student should discuss time constraints and commitments and establish their respective responsibilities, make clear any obligations to third parties, and discuss possible implications of research misconduct. In some cases, the advisor and student may face conflicts when there are simultaneous academic and RSCA obligations. In these cases, the RSCA advisor and/or the student should contact the department chair (or associate dean if the chair is the RSCA advisor) for guidance.

Situations may arise in which an advisor allows competing commitments/obligations or third-party involvement to influence his or her role as a teacher, mentor, or supervisor of RSCA, to the detriment of the student's educational experience. Such influence could include transmission of student's RSCA results to the organization before the project has been completed; inability of an advisor who is frequently absent from the research setting to give appropriate advice on the conduct of student's RSCA; and pressure on students to change research directions to work on projects that strengthen an external organization's position. The ultimate goal is to establish a clearly defined relationship between all parties and establish a quality educational experience.

### C. Financial Support

The University affirms the student's right to know the source(s) of the RSCA funding. Should a student choose to reject financial assistance linked to the source, the student has the right to do so without adverse consequences.

### D. Oversight

The University, and by extension the RSCA advisor, is committed to protecting the educational interests of students and maintaining an open environment free from undue influence of private interests. Allegations of deviations from acceptable standards in this regard should be brought to the attention of the college or division head and/or the AVP for Research. Such allegations will be investigated, and, where appropriate, action taken by the appropriate administrative officer. Any action is subject to review by the next level of administration and through standard University grievance processes to the extent applicable by authorized employees.

### E. Recognition

Significant scholarly or artistic contributions from students must be acknowledged by the RSCA advisor. Prior to bringing students into a RSCA project, the RSCA advisor must discuss what is meant by significant contributions within the discipline.

## II. Sponsored Projects

Sponsored projects are funded activities in which there is a formal written agreement (i.e., grant, contract, or cooperative agreement) and may be thought of as a transaction in which there is a specified statement of work with a related, reciprocal transfer of something of value. An externally-funded sponsored project is an agreement between SJSU and an external sponsor; such agreements are enforceable by law and performance is usually accomplished under time and fund use constraints with the transfer of support revocable for cause.

The University adopts the following guidelines governing sponsored projects:

### A. Oversight of Sponsored Projects

With respect to externally-funded sponsored projects, the policies in Integrated CSU Administrative Manual Section 11000 “serve as the fundamental system-wide requirements governing the California State University’s (CSU) involvement with the solicitation, acceptance and administration of awards from extramural sponsors for the conduct of research and scholarly activity, and other sponsored activities.” [ICSUAM Section 11001.00]. ICSUAM Section 11002.01. Section 1.5 defines "Recipient" of a sponsored project as the university or auxiliary, but not an individual, department or other constituent unit. Section 1.8 "Sponsored Program Administrator" (SPA) is defined by the Recipient as the entity that will administer the grant or contract. At SJSU, it can be the University, the Research Foundation (Office of Sponsored Programs) or the Tower Foundation (pre-award

work for Tower Foundation is performed by Corporate and Foundation Relations).

In consultation with the Associate Vice President (AVP) for Research or his/her designee (hereafter: the term AVP for Research includes his/her designee except where specified), SPAs help the Principal Investigator (PI) address the requirements governing proposal preparation and submission, award negotiation, and post-award management. SPAs assist with identification of possible funding opportunities, management of solicitation of internal applications for limited submission opportunities, and facilitate development of current and pending reports. SPAs also negotiate and execute Materials Transfer Agreements, Non-Disclosure Agreements, IP and Tech transfer agreements, and all other legal instruments associated with sponsored programs.

The PI, acting for and on behalf of SJSU, has primary responsibility for the management of his/her sponsored project in accordance with federal, state, University, and sponsor requirements. For every funded award, a single PI must be designated who personally participates in the project to a significant degree. In circumstances where a sponsor specifies that the PI must be the President, Provost or Dean, the designated PI will serve on behalf of the President, Provost, or Dean.

## B. Principal Investigator Eligibility

1. Internal Eligibility

The PI and any co-PIs must be qualified by education, training and experience in the area in which the funded RSCA or other project is being conducted. Generally, faculty members at SJSU on the tenure-line having the rank of Assistant, Associate or Full Professor as described in their letter of appointment are eligible to be a PI on sponsored projects. A co-PI may be a faculty member, student, or other University personnel.

2. External Eligibility

Certain sponsors or funders may specify PI or co-PI eligibility criteria. Such criteria may include degree(s), awards/honors, tenure, how many times the individual has been a PI, faculty membership, etc. In addition to the sponsor's criteria, the potential PI or co-PI must be aware of his/her own responsibilities, have approval from his/her unit, and meet PI and co-PI eligibility requirements as dictated by SJSU policy.

3. Exceptions

An administrator, faculty member in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP), emeritus, temporary, adjunct, visiting, volunteer faculty, University, or auxiliary employee may serve as PI or co-PI with the prior authorization of the AVP for Research. For academic personnel, PI and co-PI status must be recommended at the department and/or college level pertaining to expertise and by the Dean or designee based on the stated willingness of the potential PI to comply with administrative and fiduciary requirements. Non-academic personnel will use a parallel recommendation process. The petition for exception is forwarded along with a Curriculum Vitae or resume to the AVP for Research for final decision. The exception may provide limited approval for a specific proposal or provide status for submissions for a specified period. If the AVP for Research does not approve the request, the dean will be notified and alternative PI solutions will be discussed.

**C. Externally-Funded Proposal Submission, Review, and Approval**

All requests for externally-funded, sponsored projects (including but not limited to letters of intent, contracts or grant proposals that might be construed as a SJSU commitment to the external party) shall only be submitted to sponsoring agencies with prior written approval of the president and the chief financial officer, or their designees (at SJSU, the AVP for Research and AVP for Finance, respectively). The designees work closely with the SPA through which external funding proposals are submitted and subsequent awards are received. Other responsibilities of the SPA include: negotiating and accepting awards on behalf of the University and PI (it must be emphasized that all awards are given to the institution and not to the PI); drafting, negotiating and executing subcontracts; representing SJSU and the PI when interacting with sponsors. The Office of Research, SPA, and the PI are jointly responsible for ensuring institutional compliance with Federal and State regulations; sponsor policy and University policy compliance; coordinating pre-award and post-award actions that require either institutional or sponsor prior approval; and reporting responsibilities. Individual faculty members or non-authorized staff may not negotiate, sign, amend, or accept externally funded contracts and grants on behalf of SJSU or its auxiliaries. As noted above, each contract or grant proposal for extramural funding of RSCA, training, and public service projects, and extramural awards received for such projects, must name an eligible employee of the University or auxiliary to serve as a principal investigator (see Section II B. to review eligibility guidelines).

Funding proposals to support students' RSCA activity must be sponsored by an eligible PI, as the designated PI. A student may be listed as a co-PI, but may not be the point of contact or PI for the project. In general, students who

participate in sponsored programs must conform to all rules under the RSCA Student-Advisor Section 1, in addition to the policies listed in Table 1.

### D. Principal Investigator Responsibilities

While there may be any number of co-PIs, there must be one individual who is recognized as PI (Lead PI) and is ultimately responsible to:

- Conduct the sponsored project and complete required reports and deliverables in accordance with applicable University, SPA, and sponsor or funder policies and guidelines;
- Ensure that all required University and SPA forms and certifications are completed in a timely manner;
- Conduct the work on the project according to the research protocol or statement of work that was submitted with the original proposal or as subsequently modified by the sponsor or funder in agreement with the PI and the University/SPA;
- Manage the project budget so that funds are spent in accordance with financial and administrative policies and ensure timely submission of expenses for reimbursement;
- Manage project personnel in compliance with federal and state laws, as well as University and SPA policy;
- Manage the retention and storage of all programmatic technical materials and reports in accordance with sponsor or funder guidelines and requirements.

### E. Principal Investigator Performance, Compliance, and Review

Satisfactory progress and review of sponsored programs are determined by the sponsor or funding agency on a project-by-project basis. Any issues or concerns with the performance or regulatory compliance of a PI regarding adherence to University and SPA policies and procedures initially will be addressed with the PI by the SPA in consultation with the AVP for Research. If the PI is non-responsive or if the response does not result in adherence to applicable policies and procedures, the AVP for Research will involve the dean or University official to resolve the circumstances including possible reassignment of PI responsibilities to accomplish compliance.

## III. Proprietary and Confidential Information in RSCA

In general, while it is the policy of SJSU that RSCA should be accomplished openly and without prohibitions on the publication and dissemination of the results of academic and RSCA activities, in certain circumstances issues related to confidentiality or proprietary

RSCA may take precedence. Proprietary RSCA refers to information or materials that cannot be made public or disseminated without the approval of the entity that owns the proprietary rights to that information or materials. SJSU recognizes that some publishable work can best be accomplished if a University investigator(s) has access to a sponsor's proprietary information or materials. Confidential research is any research that may need be kept non-public, but is not necessarily proprietary (e.g., medical or academic records). Specific situations are governed by complementary policies. Classified research is covered by SJSU University Policy F69-12. Student theses are governed by SJSU University Policy S14-10. RSCA involving human subjects are governed by SJSU University Policies S08-7 and F08-1. RSCA dissemination related to Intellectual Property and Conflict of Interest is governed by SJSU University Policies S96-11, F98-3, and S99-11. The pursuit of RSCA upholds the principles of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility as outlined in SJSU University Policy S99-8.

**A. Confidentiality in RSCA Projects**

Information gathered and/or generated in RSCA projects may need to be considered as confidential. This information may include, but is not limited to, personal information regarding other RSCA team members, industry partners, and funders, as well as intellectual property, marketing plans, and financial and operational information. Every member of a RSCA team must take all reasonable precautions to ensure that access to this information is restricted to authorized individuals as determined by the PI of the team. RSCA team members may travel with confidential information to a location on campus or outside the campus, but team members must receive permission to do so from the PI. PI's should inform students on the requirements of confidentiality and to mentor students as to the appropriate uses and contexts for sharing RSCA information. When contacted by the media regarding a RSCA project, only designated media spokespersons are authorized to communicate with media sources.

**B. Non-Disclosure Agreements in RSCA Projects**

A Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) is a legally binding agreement that typically:

- Defines and describes information, knowledge, or materials to be shared between or among the parties; and
- Restricts the usage and disclosure of the shared information, knowledge, or materials.

A Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) may be proposed when the University is considering entering into a business relationship with a company or individual and where there is a need to understand or evaluate each other's technology,

research or processes, some of which might be proprietary or otherwise sensitive or confidential in nature.

While NDAs are common in private industry, they may be inappropriate in the University context, because of conflicts with the California Public Records Act, the McKee Transparency Act (which applies to all SJSU auxiliary organizations) or other laws; because they can inhibit RSCA members' and the University's ability to use information. As such, no NDA can be entered into that permanently bars dissemination and/or publication of RSCA information.

Students generally should not be asked to sign an NDA (e.g., as part of class projects or academic courses). In exceptional cases where faculty members believe it is necessary for students to enter into an NDA, they must obtain approval from an appropriate administrator.

Any NDA which purports to apply to SJSU or any department or unit thereof (or to commit or bind SJSU) can only be signed by an authorized SJSU administrator. Any SJSU faculty or staff member who signs without authorization could face individual legal liability for non-compliance with the NDA. The University may not pressure a RSCA team member into participating in a project that requires an NDA or in which consultation with that individual has not been conducted. NDAs which are related to individual private business or consulting are not subject to SJSU authorization. However, if these partnerships develop into a RSCA activity, a conflict of interest declaration must be made and managed by an authorized SJSU administrator, and a new NDA may be required. A conflict of interest declaration is also required if the RSCA member is participating both in an individual consulting and a sponsored RSCA project with the same entity.

Any questions regarding proprietary research, confidential research, or the use of NDAs should be referred to the Office of Research.

### C. Relationships with External Entities

The following statements establish the basis, under this general policy, on which SJSU will enter into contractual agreements with external entities dealing with RSCA. External entities may operate within a proprietary environment while the University functions on the principle of free inquiry and open expression. To serve the common interests of both the University and the external entities, reasonable and workable guidelines for collaborative work must first be established.

1. SJSU enters into no contractual agreement that restrains it from disclosing the existence of the agreement, the broad nature of the work, and the identity of the sponsor.

2. As noted earlier, SJSU will not enter into any Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) agreement that permanently bars investigator(s) from publishing or otherwise disclosing the findings publicly. However, the AVP for Research, on behalf of the institution and with the concurrence of the investigator(s), may negotiate in advance to delay publication and/or presentation for a maximum of 180 days to allow sponsors to give input on whether their proprietary information may be revealed, or whether they will exercise their rights under patent clauses in agreements with the institution. The AVP for Research on behalf of the institution with the concurrence of the investigator(s) may agree to an additional delay of up to 180 days.

3. Exceptions to Section III.C.2 may be granted by the AVP for Research who may rely on the recommendation of an ad hoc committee. The AVP for Research will make an annual report to the President specifying exceptions granted under this provision.

4. This section on “Relationships with External Entities” does not apply to individual, private, consulting projects. These would be projects that are not sponsored projects or do not use university resources or SJSU students.

Table 1: Other University Policies Relating to Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities

| **Roles and responsibilities** | |
|---|---|
| S99-8 | Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility |
| S99-11 | Conflict of Interests Policy for Principal Investigators |
| S05-13 | Reporting of Organized Research and Training Units |
| F69-12 | Prohibition of Classified Research; Academic Freedom |

| | |
|---|---|
| F12-5 | Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct |
| S15-7 | Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Procedures |
| S15-8 | Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and Standards |
| **Intellectual property** | |
| F98-3 | Intellectual/Creative Property |
| S96-11 | Fair Use of Copyrighted Materials; Intellectual Property |
| **Treatment of research subjects** | |
| S14-6 | Policy and Assurance for Humane Care and Use of Animals at SJSU |
| S08-7, F08-1 | Policy for Protection of Human Research Subjects |

**Approved (C&R):** April 24, 2017
**Vote:** 13-0-0
**Present:** Anagnos, Buzanski, Chang, Cargill, Chung, Grindstaff, Heil, Matoush, Medrano, Mathur, Rodan, Stacks, Trulio

**Curricular Impact:** None anticipated.
**Financial Impact:** There is potential for University personnel to expand their grant and funding opportunities.
**Workload Impact:** The Office of Research may have increased workload as University personnel contact them for guidance in conducting RSCA, proprietary research and confidential research.

**San José State University**
**Academic Senate**
**Curriculum and Research Committee** **AS 1652**
**May 1, 2017**
**First Reading**

# Policy Recommendation: Organization of the Program Planning Process at San José State University

## Rescinds S94-2, S96-10, and F03-4

**Whereas:** The program planning process is mandated by Resolution REP 71-07 of the CSU Board of Trustees ("Performance Review of Existing Degree Major Programs"); and

**Whereas:** There are a significant number of inconsistencies and inaccuracies in the current process with respect to policies; and

**Whereas:** The process has not been updated in over 10 years; and

**Whereas:** The 2015 evaluation by WASC included recommendations for the program planning procedures on campus. Therefore, be it resolved that

**Resolved:** The following document, "ORGANIZATION OF THE PROGRAM PLANNING PROCESS AT SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY," be adopted as policy effective AY 2017-2018.

**Approved:** April 24, 2017
**Vote:** 13-0-0
**Present:** Anagnos, Buzanski, Chang, Cargill, Chung, Grindstaff, Heil, Matoush, Medrano, Mathur, Rodan, Stacks, Trulio
**Curricular Impact:** None anticipated.
**Financial Impact:** None anticipated.
**Workload Impact:** There is an expected short-term increase in staff time and data development within the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics. There will be increased workload linked to staffing of the PPC committee from the Office of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs. There is an anticipated reduction in workload for all programs.

**(followed by new policy on clean page)**

# ORGANIZATION OF THE PROGRAM PLANNING PROCESS AT SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY

## I. Authorization of Program Planning

San José State University continually monitors, updates, and improves its curriculum through the *program planning process*. While this process is mandated by a Trustee policy as found in the Chancellor's Memorandum AA 71-32,"Performance Review of Existing Degree Major Programs," SJSU's implementation of the process is also independently authorized, augmented, and supported through this policy.

## II. Program Planning Goals

Program Planning represents an opportunity for each program's faculty to improve their ability to accomplish goals that attract them to their profession, including educating students, advancing their discipline, and serving the community. By embracing rigorous internal and external examination of their program, faculty gain the perspective necessary to adapt to changing conditions, promote department health, and to provide an excellent quality education for their students.

The four key goals of the Program Planning process are:

1) To promote a continuous internal review and planning process that will provide programs with purposeful future improvement.

2) To serve as a vehicle to help programs support the mission of the university, college, and department.

3) To provide an opportunity for programs to systematically assess their course offerings, achievement of student learning outcomes, student success, retention and graduation rates, and the faculty and instructional resources necessary for providing an excellent educational experience to students.

4) To provide an opportunity for programs to review their complementary activities and how these activities strengthen the program and its goals.

## III. Establishment of the Program Planning Committee and its tasks.

A. Charge: The Program Planning Committee (PPC) is responsible for the implementation of the academic program planning process, as provided in this program planning policy, and recommends to the Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) changes in the policy, review guidelines, and other matters relating to program planning and review.

B. Membership:

The Program Planning Committee (PPC) shall be made up of the following members:

i. Office of the Provost designee (EXO)
ii. Office of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs designee (EXO)
iii. Office of Research designee (EXO)
iv. Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics designee (EXO)
v. Director of Assessment (EXO)
vi. Two Faculty Members from Applied Sciences and Arts
vii. Two Faculty Members from Business
viii. Two Faculty Members from Education
ix. Two Faculty Members from Engineering
x. Two Faculty Members from Humanities and the Arts
xi. Two Faculty Members from Science
xii. Two Faculty Members from Social Science
xiii. One Faculty Member from the General Unit
xiv. One Graduate Student
xv. One Undergraduate Student
xvi. GUP Staff Member (Non-voting)

C. Recruitment and Appointment of Members: Faculty members (other than ex-officio) shall be appointed for two-year staggered terms. The student members serve a 1-year term. Solicitation of applications to serve on the Program Planning Committee will be made through the normal Committee on Committees process for the seats designated for faculty and student members. When multiple applications are submitted for a seat, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate will select individuals to serve. In considering applicants, attention should focus on the person's expertise in areas related to curriculum and program planning and the need for continuity over time in membership for a portion of the seats.

i. The committee shall elect its chair from the faculty representatives by majority vote.
ii. All members, except as noted, shall be voting members of the committee.
iii. If a member is absent from three regularly scheduled committee meetings in an academic year, or if a member repeatedly does not perform assigned committee duties, the chair of PPC may request that the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate initiate action leading to the election of a new member.

D. Responsibilities of PPC:

i. The PPC reports and conveys its recommendations on the Program Planning Guidelines and process to C&R.
ii. PPC will maintain confidentiality of materials including all information provided to outside accreditation agencies or to outside reviewers, as specified in the Program Planning Guidelines.
iii. PPC will establish its operating procedures as needed.
iv. PPC is responsible for the review of all departmental program plans.

v. Both C&R and PPC can propose changes to the *Program Planning Guidelines*. C&R has final approval of these guidelines and conducts a full review at least once every five years.

vi. Members are expected to know the current review guidelines and program planning policy.

**IV. Scope of the Program Planning Process**

Program Planning includes both state-support and self-support programs. Each department will conduct a review of at least the following elements:

A. All undergraduate and graduate degree major programs.

B. Credential programs.

C. GE and service courses offered within the department.

D. Minor programs offered within the department.

E. A minor degree program (outside the department) specified and required by a major degree program.

F. Certificates offered within the department.

**V. The Process for Program Planning**

A. Programs that are not subject to external accreditation undergo a program planning review every seven years (measured from the beginning of the cycle). Accredited programs will undergo a program planning review within a year after the completion of an accreditation review. Programs with accreditation cycles of eight years or more will also complete a program planning mid-cycle progress review.

B. The overall program planning process shall take no longer than four semesters to complete and will be organized by the Graduate and Undergraduate Programs Office.

C. Reviews by external accreditation agencies are considered the equivalent of an external reviewer evaluation, provided that such reviews address all criteria of the program planning guidelines. PPC will make the final decision as to whether the criteria of the guidelines are met.

D. Programs that undergo external accreditation prepare a program planning self-study using a template provided by the PPC that maps the accreditation self-study onto the Program Planning Self Study Guidelines. If any components specified in the Program Planning Guidelines are missing from the accreditation self-study, programs will need to provide them.

E. In general, academic units with both graduate and undergraduate programs are reviewed in the same cycle, except in special circumstances (e.g., different external accreditation cycles).

**VI. Evaluation of the Program Plan, Feedback, and Final Action Plan**

A. The program plan is evaluated by the PPC which determines whether the review process was conducted in accordance with the published Program Planning Guidelines, and whether the plan represents a reasonable effort to meet the future needs of the students, faculty, and community. The Board of General Studies (BOGS) is responsible for evaluating the General Education portion of the self-study.

B. After its evaluation of the program plan and BOGS review, the PPC may recommend one of the following actions:

- Accept the plan and provide recommendations to be discussed at the action plan meeting.
- Require revisions and resubmission of the plan for specific reasons.
- Initiate a program termination review (See Senate Policy S06-7, S13-9) for specific reasons.

C. The PPC prepares a Letter to the Provost summarizing their findings and recommendations. This letter is copied to the program, C&R, and designated administrative individuals. Programs have the opportunity to review and correct any factual inaccuracies in this letter.

D. For program plans that are approved, an action plan meeting is established and facilitated by the chair of the PPC. Invitees to this meeting include the Provost or designee, AVP of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs, AVP of Academic Budgets and Planning, Department chair, faculty and staff of the program, Dean and Associate Deans of the respective college, and additional administrators suggested by the Provost, chair of the program, or chair of PPC.

E. At the meeting, representatives from the academic units provide updates since program review and clarifications to the Letter to the Provost. Participants at the meeting discuss the recommendations in the Letter to the Provost and any additional items. Participants agree to a final action plan with measureable goals for their next program plan cycle. The Director of Assessment will communicate to the Board of General Studies items from the final action plan related to General Education.

F. After this meeting, the draft action plan (with clear deadlines) will be reviewed by the department, dean, and PPC chair for any inaccuracies and to ensure it reflects the action plan meeting discussion.

## VII. Annual Assessment Reporting of General Education and Program Learning Outcomes

A. Programs are required to provide annual assessment updates between full reviews. These updates are to the Director of Assessment. Two separate assessments occur: one for GE courses within a program, and a second one for student learning and achievement of the overall program learning outcomes.

B. The assessment forms are created by the college assessment facilitators and the Director of Assessment.

C. The Director of Assessment reviews these reports and provides feedback to programs in between their program planning cycles.

# San José State University
# Program Planning Guidelines

## Table of Contents


**Table of Contents** **1**

**Program Planning Process** **3**

**Program Planning Procedures and Timeline** **4**

1. Developing the self-study 7

2. Setting up external reviews. 7

3. Review by the Program Planning Committee 7

4. Action Plan Meeting 8

5. GE Component 8

**APPENDICES** **9**

Appendix 1: Format of the Self-Study 9

Appendix 2: Program Planning Template 10

1. Department/Program Recommendations 11

2. Progress on Previous Action Plan 11

3. Program Descriptions 11

3.1 Program Mission and Goals 11

3.2 Summary of Degrees, Minors, Certificates and Service Courses 11

4. External Factors, Trends, and Context 11

4.1 Changes in the external environment 11

4.2 Changes in the field 11

4.3 Trends in entering student characteristics 12

4.4 Future challenges for students the program serves 12

5. Strategic Direction for the Program(s) 12

5.1 Changes to the curriculum and delivery of the program(s) 12

5.2 Faculty Recruitment and Development 12

5.3 Department Initiatives to Enhance Student Success 12
5.4 Resource Implications 12
6. Assessment of Student Learning in the Program 12
6.1 Program Learning Objectives (PLO) 12
6.2 Map of PLOs to University Learning Goals (ULG) 12
6.3 Matrix of Courses to PLOs 13
6.4 Interpretation of Assessment Results and Subsequent Actions 13
6.5 Longer Term Indicators of Student Success 13
7. Program Metrics and Required Data 13
7.1 Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation Rates 13
7.2 FTEF, SFR, Percentage T/TT Faculty 13
7.3 Additional Program Data Elements 13
8. Assessment of Student Learning in GE courses, if any 14
8.1 GE Summary and Reflection 14
8.2 Interpretation of Assessment Results and Subsequent Actions 14
9. Appendices to the Report 14
9.1 Required Data Elements 14
9.2 Accreditation Report (if applicable) 14
9.3 (Example) Curriculum flow charts, and mappings 14
9.4 (Example) Assessment rubrics 14
9.5 (Example) Student success data summary 14
9.6 (Example) Program Review 14
9.7 Other (as determined by the program) 14
Appendix 3: External Reviewer Guidelines and Process 15

# Program Planning Process

The program planning process is carried out within the framework of the University Program Planning Policy. Although the unit of analysis is the program, defined as a sequence of studies leading to a degree, minor, certificate or teaching credential, typically all programs within a single department are reviewed at the same time. In addition, minors that are specified and required by a major degree program are evaluated in conjunction with that major degree program. Concentrations are separate degree programs. Teacher education programs meeting the requirements of the California Commission on Teacher Credential (CCTC) are reviewed as programs. Accredited programs follow the same process as non-accredited programs, but use a modified program planning self-study template (see 'Accredited Programs' in Appendix 1).

Program planning is future-oriented and evidence-based; program goals provide a strategic framework intended to guide all key aspects of the program's activities such as student success, student recruitment, assessment of program learning outcomes, curriculum and curriculum development, faculty hiring, research, scholarship or creative activities (RSCA), and interaction with the community. Program planning and evaluation involve faculty at the department, college, and university levels and culminate with the Provost's approval of clearly articulated goals, metrics, and a plan for achieving these goals. A well written program plan draws together evidence to build a picture of the evolution of the environment (e.g., technological, social, economic, political, environmental and legal) and the needs of key stakeholders (e.g., students, potential employers, the University, the CSU, professional and industry associations, relevant interest groups). It documents the current state of the program and articulates the initiatives and resources needed to meet the challenges the program anticipates it will need to address during the next program planning cycle, and beyond. Programs may also review University Policy S93-14 "Curricular Priorities" in developing their program plan.

Table 1 lists example questions that the program could consider and address in its self-study report.

**Table 1: Example Questions to Consider in the Self-Study**

- How are technological, social, economic, environmental, political and legal factors likely to alter the careers for which we are preparing our students?
- What changes in career opportunities, professional practice, technology, or other relevant discipline characteristics are students completing this program likely to face?
- What changes are expected in the characteristics or academic backgrounds of students coming into the program?
- What changes in the curriculum (e.g., for lifelong learning, good citizenship, living in a complex, multicultural society, etc.) should be considered to improve student success and better prepare future students for their lives and careers?
- What are some the most pressing challenges our students currently face and will face in the next 5 to 10 years? And, how can our programs address these challenges (e.g., through curriculum, modes of instructional delivery, advising, academic support)?
- What challenges do faculty face, both in their career development, and the life-work balance that are unique to our region?
- What faculty recruitment and development opportunities are needed to support the program?
- What changes in support resources (e.g., staff, equipment, infrastructure, travel funds, etc.) are needed to maintain or change the program quality, size, and achievement of student learning outcomes and RSCA?

*Note: this list is neither exhaustive nor definitive.*

# Program Planning Procedures and Timeline

The timing for program planning is governed by University Policy (i.e., Section V). The primary steps for program planning are summarized in Table 2. The entire process should take no longer than 4 semesters to complete. Each step is discussed in detail below.

**Table 2. Summary of Program Planning Timeline**

| Activity | Primary Responsible Party(ies) |
|---|---|
| **Semester 1** | |
| 1. Developing the Self-Study | |
| • Meeting with Dean to discuss the elements of the self-study | Dean and Department. |
| • Department requests required and any optional data elements from Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics | Department and Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics |
| • Complete the Program Planning checklist to ensure that program adheres to the guidelines (page limits, GE included, Data elements included).<br>• Prior to Dean review, Chair of Program Planning checks the self-study for completeness.<br>• Self-study sent to the Dean for review. | Department, Chair of Program Planning. |
| **Semester 1 and Semester 2** | |
| • Dean reviews, prepares a brief written commentary, and approves the self-study. | Dean |
| 2. Setting up external reviews | |
| • Provide the vitae of three external reviewers to the college dean (in the case of accredited programs, no additional reviewers are required).<br>• Dean ranks reviewers and forwards rankings to AVP of GUP.<br>• AVP of GUP selects and invites external reviewer. | Department, Dean, and AVP of GUP |

| Activity | Primary Responsible Party(ies) |
|---|---|
| • Itinerary for external review is created and travel arrangements are made. | Department, Office of GUP |
| **Semester 2** | |
| 3. External Review | |
| • External Reviewer Visit | Department |
| • External review received electronically by GUP and Department. | External Reviewer, GUP and Department. |
| • Either a response to the External Reviewer's Report or memo indicating that no response is required from the department is sent to the College Dean and GUP. | Department |
| **Semester 3 and Semester 4** | |
| 4. Review by the Program Planning Committee | |
| • BOGS returns feedback on GE courses to PPC<br>• All material provided to PPC for evaluation.<br>• PPC evaluates all material.<br>• Letter to Provost prepared and submitted. | BOGS, PPC and GUP Office |
| 5. Action plan meeting | |
| • Action Plan meeting with Provost or designee, department faculty and staff, Dean, Deputy Provost, AVP-GUP, AVP-Research, Program Planning Chair is held.<br>• Action plan is prepared and signed. | Chair, PPC and GUP |

## 1. Developing the self-study

The program planning process begins with the department (or program) faculty meeting with their dean to discuss challenges the program anticipates (see Table 2), the department's strengths, weaknesses, threats and areas of opportunity, and suggest initiatives and actions needed to meet those challenges. In developing its plan, programs should be guided by the department, college, and university's vision mission, and draw on any strategic planning that has occurred within the department or college. The department prepares a document, called the self-study. The template guides the self-study (found on the GUP website). Appendices to the self-study are used for presentation of detailed data, while the narrative sections of the self-study provide interpretation, context, perspective, and analysis.

### Responsibility for Self-study

Detailed guidelines for preparing and formatting the self-study are outlined in Appendix 1. The department could designate a faculty member to coordinate the development of the self-study, for which release time may be awarded; however, all faculty should be involved in its development. Funding of release time from GUP is only available for non-accredited programs. Release time funds are transferred from the GUP office to the respective dean's office only after the self-study is complete and submitted to the dean. Department chairs/Program Directors have the responsibility to ensure that all tasks necessary to develop a self-study are assigned and completed (see Table 2 above for timeline of self-study). It is the responsibility of the dean's office to ensure completion of the self-study in a timely fashion. Once the self-study is complete, it is forwarded to the Dean's office for approval and brief commentary.

## 2. Setting up external reviews.

Once the dean has commented on and approved the self-study, the department provides the CVs for three external experts in the discipline to evaluate the program. The dean reviews these CVs, rank orders them, and forwards them to GUP. The AVP picks an external reviewer. Details for the external review process is outlined Appendix 2. The review is completed and submitted by the end of semester 2.

## 3. Review by the Program Planning Committee

After the program faculty have had an opportunity to respond to the external reviewer's report in writing, all of the documents are submitted electronically to the Graduate and Undergraduate Programs Office (e.g., self-study, external reviewer report, response to reviewer). These are reviewed by the University Program Planning Committee (PPC),

which provides a university-wide perspective on the program and makes recommendations to the Provost. The department will be provided a copy of the letter to check for factual inaccuracies. This letter will then be provided to the Provost and will schedule a meeting with the Provost (or Provost's designee) to complete the overall process.

## 4. Action Plan Meeting

The Office of GUP will schedule a meeting with Provost (or designee), the Department/Program, College Dean, AVP-GUP, AVP-Research, Program Planning Chair and other administrators as needed. At that meeting, the Provost (or designee), dean, department chair, faculty, and staff, and the chair of the PPC will discuss program recommendations and develop an action plan. The draft action plan will be circulated to the Dean and the department before it is finalized. The action plan will be signed by the department chair, the Dean and the Provost (or designee). One copy of the signed Action Plan will be kept by GUP, one by the College and one by the department. This Action Plan will be used to guide the department in its activities in the upcoming program cycle. GUP is the official site of records and is responsible for electronic distribution of materials to concerned entities.

## 5. GE Component

For programs with GE courses and for which BOGS has made recommendations to the PPC, the Director of Assessment will communicate any relevant items in the Action Plan to BOGS.

# APPENDICES

## Appendix 1: Format of the Self-Study

All self-studies must use the Program Planning Template (see Appendix 2). If some items in the template are not applicable to a program do not delete them but indicate "N/A" under that heading. The main text of the report will be **no more than 25 pages** for a department with one degree program. Departments that offer two or more degree programs, concentrations, or interdisciplinary programs in conjunction with other departments may add a maximum of **five pages per program** to the main text, appropriately expanding the relevant sections. For example, a department with both an undergraduate and a graduate degree will have a maximum of 30 pages to incorporate both programs into Sections 1 through 8. The entire self-study must be submitted as one pdf file.

### Accredited Programs

Accredited programs are required to include all of the elements of the standard Program Planning Template. These programs will use a modified template to map self-study headings onto the corresponding sections in their accreditation submission. Where there is no corresponding section, the required information must be included in the self-study. Questions regarding sufficiency of correspondence in accreditation submissions should be discussed between the program coordinator and the PPC.

## Appendix 2: Program Planning Template

<Instructions for Program Planning Guidelines and Template: Please replace all <text in brackets> with the requested information, and delete these instructions before submitting to the dean. Self-studies have a **25-page limit** for departments with a single degree program, excluding appendices. Five pages may be added to the main text for each additional degree program. Special Note: If an area does not pertain to your department/program, please do not delete it. Instead, place "not applicable.">

# PROGRAM PLANNING REPORT TEMPLATE
# SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY

<DEPARTMENT OR SCHOOL NAME>
<PROGRAM(S)>
<COLLEGE>
<DEPARTMENT WEBSITE>

| | |
|---|---|
| **Department Chair or School Director:** | <Name, address, email, and phone number> |
| **Faculty Program Plan Coordinator:** | <Name, address, email, and phone number><br>Faculty Program Plan Coordinator: <Faculty name, address (if different from above), email, and phone number> |
| **External Reviewer:** | <Name, affiliation, title, address, email, and phone number> |
| **Date of Report:** | <Date report is completed and submitted to dean> |
| **Date Due to PPC:** | <Date report is completed and submitted to dean> |
| **Chair of PPC/ PPC Liaison:** | |
| | |

Submissions: Reports are to be submitted electronically as one document. Please email the program plan, request for external reviewer (if applicable), and external reviewer's report to programplanning@sjsu.edu. In addition, please cc. the above email on all communications with the dean, external reviewer, Program Planning Committee, and GUP on matters pertaining to your program plan.

## 1. Department/Program Recommendations

<Based on the self-study, the department must propose a plan of action for execution in the upcoming program planning cycle. List action items or recommendations for future improvement of student learning, student success, and program operations. Describe resources and timelines required for each. Please consider all categories of program review in this report.>

## 2. Progress on Previous Action Plan

<Summarize outcomes of the previous final action plan.>

## 3. Program Descriptions

3.1 Program Mission and Goals

<Include the program's mission and goals here>

3.2 Summary of Degrees, Minors, Certificates and Service Courses

<The purpose of this section is to summarize the main curricular contributions of the department. List the degrees, minors, and certificates the program offers. Summarize the service courses offered within the department (e.g., GE courses, courses serving other degree programs). Include a brief statement or table of how unit distributions within the degree programs meet relevant concentration and core curriculum policies and compliance of EO 1071. Include justification of PE waiver request as per University policies, S14-11 and S13-3. >

## 4. External Factors, Trends, and Context

<In this section (Section 4), include only those factors that have a significant impact on your program.>

4.1 Changes in the external environment

<Describe expected changes in the technological, social, economic, environmental, political and legal context of the program and the field. Data can come from alumni surveys, industry partners, review of policy changes, as well as other sources that are relevant to the discipline.>

4.2 Changes in the field

<Describe expected changes in career opportunities, professional practice, technology, or other relevant discipline characteristics. This would be the place in your plan in which you might explain how RSCA, community engagement, and

other activities that support intellectual engagement and currency, impact the program's curriculum.>

4.3 Trends in entering student characteristics

<Describe trends in academic and demographic characteristics of entering students and relevant impacts it will have on the program>

4.4 Future challenges for students the program serves

<Describe relevant challenges students the program serves currently face and will face in the next 5 to 10 years and impacts it has on the program>

## 5. Strategic Direction for the Program(s)

5.1 Changes to the curriculum and delivery of the program(s)

<Describe any proposed changes to the program(s) needed to meet the changes, trends, and challenges described in Section 4. This section should include planned changes to degrees, minors, certificates and service courses.>

5.2 Faculty Recruitment and Development

<Describe the implications of the changes noted in Section 4 for faculty recruitment and development.>

5.3 Department Initiatives to Enhance Student Success

<Describe planned department initiatives to facilitate student success (e.g., advising, high-impact practices).>

5.4 Resource Implications

<Describe resources needed, no longer needed, or that could be reallocated to fulfill the program's mission and meet the challenges described in Section 4.>

## 6. Assessment of Student Learning in the Program

6.1 Program Learning Objectives (PLO)

<Include the program's learning outcomes.>

6.2 Map of PLOs to University Learning Goals (ULG)

<Include a mapping of the program learning outcomes to the University Learning Goals.>

6.3 Matrix of Courses to PLOs

<Include a mapping of the courses to the program's learning outcomes at the introduced, reinforced, and mastery levels.>

6.4 Interpretation of Assessment Results and Subsequent Actions

<Provide analysis, interpretation and subsequent actions and recommendations based on the assessment data. Include relevant supporting data in an appendix.>

6.5 Longer Term Indicators of Student Success

<Examples might be job placement, attainment of higher level degrees, leadership roles, publication and success in creative activities.>

## 7. Program Metrics and Required Data

7.1 Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation Rates

<Describe trends in new freshmen and transfer enrollments, 1st year retention rates, graduation rates, and number of graduates from your program. Report numbers for total, underrepresented minorities (URM), and non-URM populations. Compare your numbers to college and university averages, and explain significant deviations, if any. Compare 4-yr and 6-yr graduation rates for first-time freshmen, and 2-yr and 4-yr graduation rates for transfer students, to the university targets for total, URM and non-URM populations.>

7.2 FTEF, SFR, Percentage T/TT Faculty

<Discuss the program's faculty headcount, full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF), student-faculty ratio (SFR) and the ratio of tenured and tenure-track (T/TT) to lecturer positions in the program. Examine how faculty hiring and workload practices relate to the program's mission, goals, and student outcomes.>

7.3 Additional Program Data Elements

<Discuss other significant developments or insights about the program using the remaining Program Planning Data Elements. Include all required data elements in the order they are given along with any optional elements that would help inform future directions and decision-making for the program.>

## 8. Assessment of Student Learning in GE courses, if any

8.1 GE Summary and Reflection

<Summarize the program's involvement in GE over the past program planning cycle and any plans for the next program planning cycle. Reflect on how well the programs' GE courses contribute to their GE Area Goals and to the larger General Education Program Outcomes. (This summary and reflection shall be no more than two pages). This is "Part 1" under "Program Review: GE Component" in the GE Guidelines. >

8.2 Interpretation of Assessment Results and Subsequent Actions

<Provide analysis, interpretation and subsequent actions and recommendations based on the assessment data. Refer to the GE continuing certification material in Appendix 9.5.>

## 9. Appendices to the Report

9.1 Required Data Elements
9.2 Accreditation Report (if applicable)
9.3 (Example) Curriculum flow charts, and mappings
9.4 (Example) Assessment rubrics
9.5 (Example) Student success data summary
9.6 (Example) Program Review

GE Component (refer to GE Guidelines, page 11 for details

9.7 Other (as determined by the program)

# Appendix 3: External Reviewer Guidelines and Process

*1. Role of External Reviewer*

The reviewer's role is to bring an informed and dispassionate view to the assessment of the plan as it is presented. Before visiting the campus, the reviewer should review the Program Plan submitted by the Department.

**Table 3: Guiding Elements/ Possible Questions for the External Reviewer**

- How does the department/program address important trends in technological, social, political and economic environment, and trends in the discipline, nationally and locally?
- How does the plan respond to the challenges and opportunities identified?
- How does the plan respond to assessment materials included in the report?
- How does the plan address curricular, advising, and research needs to enhance student success and prepare students for their future careers?
- How is the plan aligned with the current university strategic plan and priorities as well as program, departmental, and university learning outcomes?
- What are the measurable outcomes of the plan? Are they germane and realistic?
- How does the plan address the educational needs of the diverse community of which SJSU is a part?

*Note: this list is neither exhaustive nor definitive.*

During the visit, the reviewer will meet with students, faculty, and administrators. An initial interview will be held on the first day with the Dean and AVP-GUP. At the end of the visit, the reviewer will be asked to present initial impressions and findings at an exit interview, which will include the dean, faculty from the department, AVP-GUP, representative(s) from the Provost's office, the Director of Assessment, and representative from the Program Planning Committee.

*2. External Reviewer Selection Criteria*

The Department nominates at least three candidates as the external reviewer, who

meet the following criteria:

- Demonstrated leader in the field (publications or creative works; reputation in instruction; active participation in appropriate scholarly and/or professional activities).
- Familiarity with academic/professional goals of the departments as well as the nature of the program being reviewed (e.g., experience with similar programs, experience with graduates of program being reviewed).
- Affiliation with an accredited academic department/program, or with a professional organization appropriate to the program being reviewed.
- No conflict-of-interest (i.e., no graduate of program, recent employee, friend or relative of any member of the program, recent contractual arrangements with program).
- Willingness to work within the financial constraints of SJSU (see Budget below).

The department contacts potential candidates to confirm that they would be willing to serve as an external reviewer.

*3. Budget*

- Cost of travel, not to exceed rates available from a University contracted travel agency.
- Cost of accommodations
- $1,000 honorarium
- If the program/department wishes to offer additional funds, it may do so at its own expense.

*4. Procedures*

A. At the time of the self-study submission, the department/program submits to the Dean the CVs of the three candidates who are acceptable to the department and able to serve within the required time period as agreed upon. The Dean rank orders the reviewers and provides to the AVP-GUP with the CVs.

B. The AVP-GUP selects one reviewer from the candidates and notifies the department of the selection.

C. The department arranges for the date of the review and the site visits. The Office of GUP engages the reviewer and sends contract and other relevant documents (Self-Study of Program, Program Planning Guidelines, Rubric for Evaluation of Program, Curricular Priorities, and letter of invitation) to the

reviewer.

D. The department then arranges the schedule of the visit, including the entrance and exit interviews, in consultation with the College, the Program Planning Committee Chair, the Office of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs, and Office of Research.

E. The department contacts the reviewer one month prior to visit to see if they need anything else.

F. At the time of the visit, the Office of GUP transfers funds to the College. The department arranges for all payments of honoraria and airfare.

G. The reviewer must submit an electronic final report to the Office of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs within three weeks of the completion of the visit.

*5. External Reviewer Visit*

A. Time: One and a half days to two days for site visit.

B. People to meet while on campus:

- Department faculty, staff, students, and Department Chair (Alumni if possible)
- College Dean and Associate Deans
- AVP of GUP
- AVP of Research
- Provost (Optional)
- Program Planning Committee Chair or designee

C. Required Meetings:

- Initial interview with the Dean and AVP-GUP.
- Exit meeting for Reviewer to present initial impressions, to which all persons in the unit may attend. The following people are invited to the Exit meeting: representative(s) of the Provost; AVP-GUP, college dean; department chair and faculty; PPC Chair or designee; University Director of Assessment; AVP for Research, and other relevant constituencies where appropriate.
- Any meetings established by the department.

D. Other aspects of the visit

- Selected student products should be available for review (i.e., papers, projects, creative works, awards, publications, presentations).

*6. Template for the Reviewer's Report*

The report should be 3-5 pages in length and should be guided by the rubric posted on the GUP website. Findings should be based on evidence that is collected in response to the primary focal points of the Self-Study. It must also include recommendations for change if the reviewer's evaluation finds that the plan is inadequate in the light of assessment responses or other reasons that are explained. If possible, it should also include comparisons with other programs in institutions and communities that are similar to SJSU. The format of the report should include an executive summary (i.e., summarize key recommendations), an analysis of the curriculum and assessment, review of student experience and success, evaluation of resources (i.e., planning, personnel, program management), identification of challenges and opportunities, and conclusions and recommendations[1].

[1] See GUP website for suggested template for External Reviewer Report and suggested program review rubric for use by external reviewers

**San José State University**
**Academic Senate**
**Curriculum and Research Committee** **AS 1653**
**May 1, 2017**
**First Reading**

# Policy Recommendation: SJSU Graduate and Undergraduate University Learning Goals

**Legislative History:** Rescinds S13-2

**Rationale:** Since the passage of this university policy in Spring 2013, the campus has received recommendations from our recent WASC accreditation report regarding our University Learning Goals (ULGs). It is important to establish the qualities that define the competencies of SJSU graduates to inform both undergraduate and graduate current and future students, as well as the community, about the expected achievements of an SJSU education. SJSU graduate programs also recognized that the ULGs needed adjustment to be inclusive to graduate curriculum.

**Whereas:** The first ULGs were generated by the Mission, Outcomes and Meaning WASC task force in consultation with the University Council of Chairs and Directors (UCCD), Associate Deans, Deans and the WASC Steering Committee within the categories defined by the San José State University Academic Senate (SS-S12-3); and

**Whereas:** This same consultation process was used to revise these ULGS; and

**Whereas:** These ULGs were designed such that they would articulate with existing assessment strategies; and therefore be it

**Resolved:** That the following University Learning Goals be adopted, effective AY 2017-2018, as the University Learning Goals for San José State University.

**Approved (C&R):** April 24, 2017

| | |
|---|---|
| **Vote:** | 11-0-0 |
| **Present:** | Anagnos, Buzanski, Chang, Chung, Grindstaff, Heil, Medrano, Mathur, Rodan, Stacks, Trulio |
| **Absent:** | Cargill, Matoush |
| **Curricular Impact:** | Programs may adjust some of their program learning outcomes to better align with these ULGs and thus there may be changes in some of their curricular offerings. |
| **Financial Impact:** | None anticipated. |
| **Workload Impact:** | These revised ULGs require programs to re-map their program learning outcomes for both their undergraduate and graduate programs. This is a process that would occur before our next full WASC accreditation visit. |

# University Learning Goals

San Jose State University graduates will have developed:

**Social and Global Responsibilities**

- An ability to consider the purpose and function of one's degree program training within various local and/or global social contexts and to act intentionally, conscientiously, and ethically with attention to diversity and inclusion.

**Specialized Knowledge**

- Depth of knowledge required for a degree, as appropriate to the discipline.

· **Intellectual Skills**

- Fluency with specific theories, assumptions, foundational knowledge, analytical and interpretive protocols, tools, and technologies appropriate to the discipline or field of study.
- Skills necessary for mastery of a discipline at a level appropriate to the degree and leading to lifelong learning, including critical and creative thinking and practice, effective communication, thorough and ethical information gathering and processing, competence with quantitative and/or qualitative methodologies, and productive engagement in collaborative activities.
- *For undergraduate students in a baccalaureate program*: an understanding of critical components of broad academic areas, including the arts, humanities, social sciences, and sciences.

· **Integrative Skills**

- Mastery in each step of an investigative, creative, or practical project (*e.g.*, brainstorming, planning, formulating hypotheses or complex questions, designing, creating, completing, and communicating) with integration within and/or across disciplines.
- An ability to articulate the potential impacts of results or findings from a particular work or field in a societal context.

· **Applied Knowledge and Skills**

- An ability to apply theory, practice, and problem solving to new materials, settings, and problems.