

**SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE**

**2015/2016**

**Agenda**

**May 9, 2016, 2:00 pm – 4:00 pm**

**Engineering 285/287**

- I. **Call to Order and Roll Call –**
- II. **Approval of Minutes –  
Senate Minutes of April 25, 2016**
- III. **Communications and Questions**
  - A. From the Chair of the Senate
  - B. From the President of the University
- IV. **Executive Committee Report**
  - A. Minutes of the Executive Committee –  
**Exec. Minutes of April 18, 2016**
  - B. Consent Calendar –
  - C. Executive Committee Action Items –  
*AS 1614, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Supporting Efforts to Reduce Student Costs for Textbooks by Encouraging the Use of High-Quality Open Educational Resource Course Material (Final Reading)*  
  
*AS 1623, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Honoring and Thanking President Susan Martin for Her Service to San José State University (Final Reading)*
- V. **Unfinished Business –**
- VI. **Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation):**
  - A. University Library Board (ULB):
  - B. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):  
*AS 1622, Policy Recommendation: Academic Certificate Programs: Review and Approval Process (Final Reading)*
  - C. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):  
*AS 1620, Policy Recommendation, Probation and Disqualification (Final Reading)*
  - D. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

***AS 1619, Policy Recommendation, Adopting New SOTE and SOLATE Instruments (Final Reading)***

***AS 1617, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Calling for Widespread Consultation Prior to Finalizing any Standards and/or Implementation Strategies Pertaining to Electronic Communications (Final Reading)***

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

**VII. Special Committee Reports:**

**VIII. New Business:**

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

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

**X. Adjournment:**

<b>Consent Calendar 2015-2016</b>				
<b>5/9/2016 Senate Meeting</b>				
<b>Policy Committees</b>				
<b>COMMITTEE</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>UNIT</b>	<b>TERM</b>	<b>NOTES</b>
Committee on Committees	Ana Pitchon	Social Sciences	2017	
<b>Operating Committees</b>				
<b>COMMITTEE</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>UNIT</b>	<b>TERM</b>	
Student Success	Ranko Heindl	Science	2017	
<b>Other Committees</b>				
<b>COMMITTEE</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>UNIT</b>	<b>TERM</b>	
Accreditation Review	Ravistha Mathur	Faculty-at-Large	2019	
Accreditation Review	Meekyung Han	Faculty-at-Large	2019	
Accreditation Review	Annette Nellen	Faculty-at-Large	2018	
Accreditation Review	Cheyla Samuelson	Faculty-at-Large	2018	
Accreditation Review	John Murray	Faculty-at-Large	2017	
Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention	Erin Woodhead	Faculty-at-Large	2019	
Campus Planning Board	Shahin Gerami	Social Sciences	2018	
<b>Remove:</b>				
<b>COMMITTEE</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>UNIT</b>	<b>TERM</b>	

2015/2016 Academic Senate

MINUTES  
April 25, 2016

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

**Ex Officio:**

Present: Kimbarow, Amante, Van Selst, Lee,  
Heiden, Sabalius

**CASA Representatives:**

Present: Lee, Shifflett, Sen, Grosvenor, Schultz-Krohn

**Administrative Representatives:**

Present: Martin, Feinstein  
Absent: Larochele, Lanning, Blaylock

**COB Representatives:**

Present: Virick, Sibley, Campsey

**Deans:**

Present: Green, Jacobs, Stacks, Hsu

**EDUC Representatives:**

Present: Mathur, Laker

**Students:**

Present: Abukhdeir, Medrano, Romero, Gay  
Sandoval-Rios  
Absent: Sarris, Sandoval-Rios

**ENGR Representatives:**

Present: Hamed-Hagh, Sullivan-Green, Backer

**Alumni Representative:**

Present: Walters

**H&A Representatives:**

Present: Frazier, Khan, Grindstaff  
Absent: Bacich, Riley

**Emeritus Representative:**

Present: Buzanski

**SCI Representatives:**

Present: Kaufman, Beyersdorf, White  
Absent: Clements

**General Unit Representatives:**

Present: Matoush, Kauppila  
Absent: Medina

**SOS Representatives:**

Present: Peter, Curry, Wilson  
Absent: Coopman

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

The minutes of April 4, 2016 were approved as amended (40-0-2).

**III. Communications and Questions –**

**A. From the Chair of the Senate:**

Chair Kimbarow told the Senate that the Vice Presidents were meeting with a candidate for the Vice President of Administration and Finance position and would be arriving at 3 p.m. and will give their reports at the end of the meeting.

Chair Kimbarow reminded Senators of the reception at the President's house on Sunday, May 1, 2016. This is the first Spring reception for the Senate at the President's house.

The agenda is extremely full today, please keep your comments to a minimum.

- B. From the President of the University –**  
Interim President Martin is working closely with incoming President Papazian.

**IV. Executive Committee Report –**

**A. Executive Committee Minutes –**

**Executive Committee Minutes of March 21, 2016 –** No questions.

**Executive Committee Minutes of April 11, 2016 –** No questions.

- B. Consent Calendar –** The Senate approved the consent calendar of April 25, 2016 as written.

**C. Executive Committee Action Items:**

Chair Kimbarow presented *AS 1613, Senate Management Resolution, Conferring the Title of Honorary Senator on Dr. Judith Lessow-Hurley (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1613 passed as written** (41-0-1).

---

Chair Kimbarow presented *AS 1615, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Support of the You Can Play Project (Final Reading)*.

Senator Sabalius presented an amendment that was seconded to amend the second Resolved clause to read, "That the Division of Athletics at San José State University allocate funds to promote the...." The Senate voted and the Sabalius amendment failed (5-34-0).

**Senator Kaufman presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to strike "allocate funds to" from the first line of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Resolved clause.**

**The Senate voted and AS 1615 passed as amended (34-0-0).**

- V. Unfinished Business - None**

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

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

Senator Mathur presented *AS 1583, Policy Recommendation: Internships, Service Learning, and Off-Campus Learning Experiences (Final Reading)*.

Senator Heiden presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to add the words, "under the leadership of GUP" after "That the campus" in the 6<sup>th</sup> Resolved clause.

Senator Mathur presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to add "; and" at the end of the first Whereas clause.

Senator Frazier presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to replace "more

facile" with "simpler" before "process" in the 6<sup>th</sup> Resolved clause on the 2<sup>nd</sup> line.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was seconded to add to line 39, "by the SJSU contracts and purchasing office" after "template be created" in the first line of the 1<sup>st</sup> Resolved clause. The Senate voted and the Shifflett amendment failed (1-32-0).

**The Senate voted and AS 1583 passed as amended (33-0-0).**

---

Senator Mathur presented *AS 1607, Policy Recommendation, Restoring Options for Students with Quantitative Reasoning Disabilities Affecting Math Skills (Final Reading)*.

**The Senate voted and AS 1607 passed as written (30-0-1).**

---

Senator Mathur presented *AS 1609, Policy Recommendation, Amendment to F13-2, Technology Intensive, Hybrid and Online Courses and Programs (Final Reading)*.

**The Senate voted and AS 1609 passed as written (29-0-0).**

---

Senator Mathur presented *AS 1622, Policy Recommendation, Academic Certificate Programs: Review and Approval Process (First Reading)*.

**Questions:**

Q: What was the second to the last item you noted was changed?

A: The proposal content is clarified for the departments.

Q: Is it possible to substitute the requirements for "other certificates" using academic coursework?

A: I don't think so. The "other certificates" are non-credit.

Q: Right. If a non-credit certificate is in word processing or something, and I have an academic credit-bearing course that gives me that skill, where does that fall in this policy?

A: The policy doesn't speak to this. This policy is laying out the guidelines for academic certificate programs.

---

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

Senator Kaufman presented *AS 1608, Policy Recommendation, Student Rights and Responsibilities (Final Reading)*.

Senator Kaufman presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to remove everything from line 91 through line 103.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to line 77 to add, "and maintain a webpage with

links to each item." after "Responsibilities." The amendment was seconded. Senator Shifflett withdrew her amendment.

Senator Van Selst presented an amendment to line 75 to replace "all" with "exemplar." The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Van Selst amendment failed (7-26-0).

Senator Laker presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to replace "all" with "relevant."

**The Senate voted and AS 1608 passed as amended (33-1-0).**

---

Senator Kaufman presented *AS 1620, Policy Recommendation, Probation and Disqualification (First Reading)*.

**Questions:**

Q: Is there was anything in the policy that is different than what our current practice is?

A: Not that I'm aware of.

Q: Can we get a copy with the changes highlighted for the final reading?

A: Yes, absolutely we can do that.

Q: Is there anything you know about that will change, especially relating to graduate students?

A: Yes, one thing. Previously there was a rule on the books that if a graduate student finished their degree program entirely with a GPA under 3.0, there were a set of rules they had to follow to finish. The rules were quite draconian. They had to take two classes and they had to be graduate level and taken in the same semester. If at the end of those two classes they had not raised their GPA to 3.0, they would be permanently disqualified. This policy doesn't give them a full green light to take as many classes as they want to raise their GPA, but they can take 9 units. They can take two at a time or three classes at a time to raise their GPA. You can't do grade forgiveness as a graduate student, so it is either grade averaging or new courses.

Q: On line 342 where it describes the five categories by which a graduate student can petition for reinstatement, is the intent that the student can apply up to five times based on these categories, or is their reinstatement attempt limited to one category?

A: My understanding is that they have to pick a category to petition.

Q: Might I suggest this be written into the policy?

A: Sure.

Q: Line 411 states that reinstatement is not allowed for a second disqualification, doesn't that cover the previous question?

A: It is not quite the same thing. What was being asked was if in a single instance you could try all these ways to get back in.

Q: Why can't they try all five categories?

A: You would be willing to accept a petition from a student for extenuating circumstances at the same time they were taking courses to raise their GPA, and you would let them choose between the two?

Q: If they have the qualifications for them, why not allow them to?

A: If David Bruck says it's okay, who am I to argue.

Q: How about changing line 342 to say "on the basis of any one or more of the following five" and then they make their appeal all at once rather than appealing on one then appealing on another, and so on.

A: The committee will take that under consideration.

Q: On line 547, would you consider rewriting? I believe some teaching credential students will actually receive a degree from SJSU. Maybe you could say, "If the teaching credential program does not yield a degree"?

A: I see your point, you can actually get both a degree and a teaching credential.

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

Senator Peter presented *AS 1611, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds S02-8, Information Technology Resources Responsible Use Policy (Final Reading)*

**The Senate voted and AS 1611 passed as written (34-0-0).**

---

Senator Peter presented *AS 1616, Policy Recommendation, Amending S15-6, To Clarify Procedures for Recruitment Committees (First Reading)*.

Senator Peter explained that the PS Committee had requested this policy recommendation come to the Senate as a Final Reading, but he had mistakenly put First Reading on it. This will require a two-thirds vote in favor by the Senate.

Senator Peter presented a motion to suspend the rules and make AS 1616 a Final Reading. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the Peter motion passed (21-6-0).

Senator Mathur presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to add, "be cancelled" at the end of line 57.

Senator Curry presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change, "(and his designees)" on line 55 to read, "(and his/her designees)".

Senator Laker presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change line 36 to read, "...shall be recorded, shared with, ...".

Senator Lee presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to remove, "When committee recommendations are not unanimous," from lines 37 and 38.

**The Senate voted and AS 1616 passed as amended (29-0-3).**

---

Senator Peter presented *AS 1618, Policy Recommendation, Amends S15-7, To Clarify Secret Ballots for Choosing RTP Committees (Final Reading)*.

Senator Peter presented a motion to move AS 1618 to a final reading. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the Peter motion passed with a two-thirds vote (26-2-0).

**The Senate voted and AS 1618 passed as written (28-0-1).**

---

Senator Peter presented *AS 1619, Policy Recommendation, Adopting New SOTE and SOLATE Instruments (First Reading)*.

**Questions:**

Q: Could you please expand on the discussion you may have had in committee on question 14?

A: Of course it is subjective. Everything on the survey is subjective, but it may give you an idea of what the student thinks.

Q: Did SERB have a chance to talk over the question of "How would you describe your efforts in this course?" and why is that on the survey?

A: There seemed to be some need to get from the students how much effort they were putting into the class, because some faculty felt their courses were being graded very low by students that were not participating, so this was an attempt to get some measurement of how the student viewed their efforts in the course.

Q: On the SOLATE question number 14, "Did any other student attempt to influence your answers on the survey?," can you explain your rationale for collecting that data and how that information would be used?

A: That question also appears on the SOTE. These are flags, so that people in Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics (IEA) can find out if there has been some kind of coercion. This information is not required or reported.

Q: Item 18 on the SOTE asked students to self-report on how many hours they spent outside of class on course related activity, and it says, "(NOTE: This will be programmed to be answered as a number field, and the course units will be added to the report, allowing users to easily divide the answer by the actual course units to generate Carnegie Units," did I understand you correctly that everything after the informational items is not part of the SOTE report that faculty will receive?

A: That is my understanding, but let me ask Senator Lee from SERB.

A: My understanding is that everything from 14 on would go to faculty.

Q: So then the faculty member would see if the student answered that the faculty member had attempted to influence the student as well?

A: Yes. I asked this question to the Chair of SERB and was told the pros outweighed the cons and that this was important information that should go out.

Q: Is it the intention of SERB to use this information for institutional reporting?

A: The intention was to get faculty feedback that would help, and it would be useful to department chairs to report back to Graduate and Undergraduate Programs (GUP) the number of hours per credit unit per week that students report working on classwork.

A: The PS Committee was not unified in its understanding of how the data would be used on that point. Most members of the PS Committee would like to receive that data for their personal use. A few members were skeptical about putting that data to institutional use. It might be helpful for IEA to clarify how that data might be used for the final reading.

Q: It would certainly help me decide how to vote if SERB included information on which of these questions would come back to the faculty member and which questions would be used for other purposes.

A: The PS Committee will inform SERB. We cannot change the questions, but we could insert a Resolved clause about how the data would be used.

Q: I've heard various answers to this question, but I'd like this in the minutes. There are a lot of people concerned about SOTE questions because they are asking about teaching instead of learning. I understand it is difficult to measure learning on a survey of this nature, but I would argue it is just as hard to measure teaching. My preference would be to have the whole SOTE be a survey of learning. I'd like a response to this.

A: The PS Committee asked SERB to include questions about learning and the response was that there have been some studies done and students are notoriously poor at judging their own learning.

Q: What policy says that SOTES can't be amended, is it this one?

A: No, it is the teaching evaluation policy.

Q: The SOTES are supposed to be about teaching effectiveness and the questions from 14 on really aren't about teaching effectiveness. As all of us that deal with surveys know, one item influences other items on the survey. We are now increasing the length by about one-third, and I think decreases student interest in completing the survey. I also think that some of these questions have the potential to drive the answers to other questions.

A: If you want to approve this when it comes back, that is fine. If there is enough concern, it could be referred to SERB with instructions. The third option is to amend some of the Resolved clauses without touching the questions.

Q: Given the short time frame to approve, can we table this and have a working session with the Senate. This might be something appropriate for a Senate Retreat.

A: That is my suggestion that if it is referred back to SERB with instructions, you put in the instructions all of the concerns you'd like to see fixed. That would be for the next Senate meeting. This meeting is just for questions.

Q: What mechanisms does IEA or SERB have to do anything about connecting what someone's performance was on older SOTES compared to these SOTES?

A: In the teaching criteria of the RTP policy, there are a couple of different levels of achievement that identifies improvement from prior norms. That is built into the RTP policy. In terms of what SERB can do, in our last revision of the teaching evaluation policy we gave them broad latitude to design a variety of norms.

Q: On line 341 where it specifies, "(NOTE: This will be programmed to be answered as a number field, ..." does that mean there is a blank space there, or are there numbers already on it?

A: I presume it means you put in a number in a certain range. It originally came to PS with five different ranges to choose from and the PS Committee requested that SERB do something different, because that would have to be a question that would apply to a course that was one-unit, three-units, and six-units. That is why SERB inserted the number field.

Q: Where it specifies that, "the course units will be added to the report, allowing users to easily divide the answer by the actual course units ...," does this mean a report will be generated after everything, and the users are the people that get the report?

A: I'm not clear about this either.

Q: There is a perception that the SOTES have declined in ranking with the new online SOTES and there is also a perception that there is a correlation between grades and quality of teaching, e.g. that students perceive the higher their grade the better the teaching. Where would one go to find those kind of answers if indeed there has been deflation in the SOTES and inflation because of the grades?

A: There has been deflation when the electronic SOTES went into effect the drop was about 3/10<sup>th</sup> of a point. This is why we re-normed to reflect that. That's why we sent a memo out saying judge according to norms and not raw numbers, because the norms are quite different between the old paper SOTES and online SOTES. With regard to the relationship between grades and SOTES that was one of the major concerns the PS Committee had at the time we revised the last policy, so you can see now a little chart at the bottom showing exactly how each student that got each grade evaluated you in the course. Generally speaking, there is a relationship but it is a slight relationship. Many people that study teaching evaluations argue that it is appropriate that there is a relationship, because people that learn more ought to like you better.

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

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1605, Senate Management Resolution, Electronic Voting (Final Reading)*.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change "cal" to "call" in line 61.

Senator Frazier presented an amendment to change the word "shall" to "can" in line 22. The amendment was not seconded.

Senator Frazier presented an amendment to change "shall" to "may" in line 26. The amendment was seconded. Senator Frazier withdrew his amendment.

Senator Frazier presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change the last Resolved clause to read, "Resolved: That except in circumstances where a secret ballot is necessary, when electronic devices are used for official voting it will be done in parallel with an unofficial show of hands."

**The Senate voted and AS 1605 passed as amended (27-4-0).**

---

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1603, Policy Recommendation, Committee Obligations and Senate Membership (Modification of Bylaw 6) (Final Reading)*.

**The Senate voted and AS 1603 passed as written (30-0-0).**

---

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1590, Senate Management Resolution, Remote Attendance at Senate and Committee Meetings (Final Reading)*.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change, "thus the bylaws place" in line 41 to read, "thus the standing rule places."

Senator Peter presented an amendment to lines 66 through 71 to strike, "At the discretion of the Senate chair remote attendance may be permitted when appropriate and reliable resources are available and the work of the Senate will not be compromised. Such accommodations should be rare. The individual requesting remote attendance is responsible for making all necessary arrangements needed to facilitate remote attendance." The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Peter Amendment passed (26-5-0).

**The Senate voted and AS 1590 passed as amended (31-0-0).**

---

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1621, Policy Recommendation, Departmental Voting Rights (First Reading)*.

**Questions:**

Q: What is the status of a permanent faculty member on temporary assignment to another department?

A: You would have a full vote in your department of record, but no vote in the temporary assignment.

Q: Why should I have less of a vote than a temporary faculty member in that department?

A: Good question, I'll take it back to the committee.

Q: A common thing that I see across the campus is that there are faculty that are pulled

from their home departments to chair other departments and they are still very involved in their home department, will they now only get to vote in the department they are chairing?  
A: This was a point discussed at length in the Organization and Government Committee, and we decided to put it forward as you stated. You would have full voting rights in the department being chaired, but no voting rights in the home department. This is one of the reasons the Organization and Government Committee invites your feedback particularly on items 5 and 7.

#### **E. University Library Board (ULB) – No Report.**

### **VII. Special Committee Reports –**

Highlights of the Faculty Diversity Report by Senator Elna Green, AVP for Faculty Affairs are as follows:

The number one reason that faculty gave for declining our employment offer was the cost of housing. We have competitive salaries, but not in the context of the cost of living in the area. Another challenge is the state of our facilities, STEM in particular. We also have Proposition 209 which says we are not allowed to do opportunity hires, and we cannot set quotas. What we can do is to work to diversify the applicant pools.

We have a diversity master plan. This includes our guiding principles for the campus since 2009. This is our master plan for diversifying not only our faculty, but also the student body, the campus, and the curriculum. Faculty Affairs continues to follow the diversity master plan.

For faculty, the diversity master plan laid out a program of training and outreach and best practices. It included broadening the applicant pool by creating extra advertising and outreach, establishing faculty-in-residence programs, travel funds for recruitment activity, and extensive training for recruitment committees. Faculty Affairs is doing all of these things. Faculty Affairs has advertised in Blacks in Higher Education, Chronicle of Higher Education, Diverse Education, etc.

For the past two years Carlos Garcia has been the faculty-in-residence. Two new faculty-in-residence have been appointed for next year and they are Magdalena Barrera and Rebecca Burciaga. The faculty-in-residence work with the recruitment committees all year long and look for additional ways to do outreach and advertising. They also look for likely places to advertise where there might be a large number of graduate students in a particular area. The faculty-in-residence also participate in the training for the recruitment committees.

This year we had 66 searches approved by the Provost. Out of those 66 searches we hired 58 faculty. That is the largest number of new tenure and tenure/track faculty hired in a decade. The largest number of faculty ever hired was in 2005 when 68 tenure and tenure/track faculty were hired.

We have had 72 approved for recruitment this coming year, and as of today we have 46 signed contracts for next year. We have about 8 offers still out there waiting to come in, and about 10 recruitments still going on. However, we have had a lot of resignations. These are not

retirements, they are resignations. Last year we had 15 faculty resign. We are making gains in tenure and tenure/track density, but it is slow since we continue to lose faculty. The demographic profile of the 15 that we lost roughly parallels the demographic breakdown of the campus tenure and tenure/track faculty.

We had the largest percentage of female faculty hires this year at 58.6%. We had a larger percentage of white hires this year than in the past three years. The three-year breakdown of tenure and tenure/track hires over the past three years is 52.2% white, 30.4% minorities, and 17.4% unknown. The unknown category is troubling and is enough to make a difference if we knew where people might fall, but this is self-reported data. Other CSUs don't have as high a level of reporting "unknown" as SJSU does.

Out of the 58 hires this year, there were 14 international faculty. These included three from Canada, four from China, one from Iran, two from Russia, one from Serbia, two from S. Korea, and one from Turkey.

Data that you see on the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics (IEA) website is reported exactly how the Chancellor's Office requests the data. What this does is exclude a lot of people. The Chancellor's Office has asked us to report people that have a teaching assignment. If you are not in a teaching assignment for the Fall semester, then you get left out of the data. If you are a librarian or counselor, are out on a DIP or sabbatical that Fall semester, are on a leave of absence, or are a 1.0 Department Chair you do not get counted. In 2014, the number of those left out was pretty significant. There were 85 people that did not get counted. So you will often hear Faculty Affairs say a number that doesn't match what IEA has and this is because Faculty Affairs does include everyone.

Right now we have approximately 57% white, just under 10% unknown, and about one-third minority tenure and tenure/track faculty. We are very close to having 50/50 male and female tenure and tenure/track faculty this year. It is quite likely that with this next cycle of hiring we will get to 50/50.

### **Questions:**

Q: You mentioned that we are different than other campuses in the unknown reporting, and I was wondering if we might have families that are multi-racial and multi-ethnic?

A: There is a "multi" category, but it does not let you combine different categories.

Q: Going from 5 recruitments a year to 60 recruitments a year is really an impressive job. I commend Faculty Affairs. Do you have any information about whether the disciplinary advertisements or the group-targeted advertisements are more helpful in getting people in?

A: Carlos Garcia is currently working on tracking the places where faculty are reporting that they saw the ads. Faculty Affairs is hoping this will give them some more information about where to spend advertising dollars next year.

Q: Were any reasons given for the resignations?

A: We don't have a formal exit interview, but we do often hear from people about where they are going and what they are going to do. They are often going somewhere they will get a bump in pay, or a bump in status or rank, etc. However, Faculty Affairs does not have a formal survey instrument about that.

Q: One of the issues I think we need to address is to provide role models for our students. We need people that have shared experiences with the students that come here. I'm wondering what the extent to which the minority overlap with the international hires, because I think there is a difference between being from a traditionally underrepresented group in the U.S. and being from a foreign country. I'm also wondering what fields the women we are hiring are in?

A: Yes, there is some overlap between the category for minority and the international category. Not all international faculty are classified as minority. As far as the breakdown by department, Faculty Affairs did not do that but the information is on the IEA website.

**VIII. New Business – None.**

**IX. State of the University Announcements. Questions. In rotation.**

**A. Provost –** No report.

**B. Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF) –**

**C. Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA) –** Not Present

**D. Associated Students President –**

**E. Vice President for University Advancement (VPUA) –** No report.

**F. CSU Statewide Senators –**

**X. Adjournment –** The meeting adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

**Executive Committee Meeting**  
**April 18, 2016**  
**12-1:30 ADM 167**

Present: Kimbarow, Martin, Peter, Frazier, Shifflett, Heiden, Feinstein, Backer, Larochele, Lee, Mathur, Blaylock, Lanning, Amante, Kaufman

Absent: None

1. The minutes of April 11, 2016 were approved as amended by Senator Mathur (14-0-1).
2. Consent Calendar

There was no dissent to the consent calendar of April 18, 2016.

3. Updates:

a. From the President:

Interim President Martin continues to keep President Papazian up-to-date with recent policy recommendations from the Senate and campus events.

The Honors Convocation was held on Friday, April 15, 2016 at 6 p.m. in the Event Center and it was an outstanding event.

b. From the Provost: There was a reception held at the President's house on Saturday, April 16 for the members of the California State Student Association (CSSA) who were here for their spring meeting hosted by the SJSU Associated Students. It was a wonderful event.

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

Saturday, April 16, 2016 was "Admitted Spartans Day" on campus and they received over 11,000 RSVPs. The event was well attended and there were many departments and student organizations represented at the event.

Linked In has launched their careers app for students. SJSU was one of the first to test this app.

There are 54 candidates in the AS Elections and this is the largest number of candidates in the history of the campus.

- d. Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF):  
The Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) will hold its first meeting within the next two weeks.

There will be another Alert SJSU test in the near future.

- e. Vice President for University Advancement (VPUA):  
The Bay Area News Group merged staffing for its newspapers, including the San Jose Mercury News, on April 5, 2016. This will result in SJSU having to compete with many other cities and universities for news coverage

In addition, The KLIV all news radio station recently changed its format to country music. This will also result in a loss of favorable news reporting for SJSU.

- f. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):  
O&G will be wrapping up the Voting Rights Policy today and will be bringing that to the Senate for a first reading on April 25, 2016.
- g. Professional Standards Committee (PS):  
PS will be bringing a policy from the Student Evaluation Review Board (SERB) on new SOTES and SOLATES to the Senate on April 25, 2016 for a first reading.
- h. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):  
C&R will be bringing the Service Learning Policy to the Senate for a final reading, and the Certificate Policy for a first reading at the April 25, 2016 Senate meeting. The Program Planning Policy and revised guidelines will come to the Senate in the Fall 2016.
- i. University Library Board (ULB):  
The ULB has been discussing the use of space in the library and how lottery funds should be used.
- j. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA)  
I&SA discussed what constituted a quorum—a majority of the members plus one, but not counting non-voting members.  
I&SA will be bringing the Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy to the Senate for a final reading at the April 25, 2016 meeting. I&SA may bring a new Disqualification Policy to the Senate for a first reading also at the April 25, 2016 meeting if they can finish it today.
- k. CSU Statewide Senate:  
Senator Lee and the Executive Committee congratulated Senator Peter on his inspiring oration at the Honors Convocation.

4. The committee discussed AS 1613, Senate Management Resolution, Conferring the title of Honorary Senator on Dr. Judith Lessow-Hurley (Final Reading). A motion was made and seconded to approve the resolution. The Executive Committee voted and AS 1613 was approved (14-1-0).
5. The committee discussed AS 1614, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Supporting Efforts to Reduce Student Costs for Textbooks by Encouraging the Use of High Quality Open Educational Resource Course Material (Final Reading). A motion was made, seconded and approved to postpone the resolution in order to resolve some remaining concerns.
6. Per Senate bylaw 1.6.2c, the committee discussed and approved the appointment of seven new Senators recommended by the colleges and the general unit for one-year terms
7. The committee discussed creating an online form and sending out a link to it to all faculty specifically for the at-large seats available on some of the Senate committees. AVC Backer will send an email to all faculty this week with the link
8. The meeting adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

These minutes were taken by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on April 21, 2016, and edited by Chair Michael Kimbarow on April 22, 2016. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on May 2, 2016.

5  
6 **Sense of the Senate Resolution**

7  
8 **Supporting Efforts to Reduce Student Costs for Textbooks by**  
9 **Encouraging the Use of High-Quality Open Educational Resource**  
10 **Course Material**

11  
12 **Whereas** Assembly Bill 798 (AB 798), “College Textbook Affordability Act of 2015”  
13 aims to encourage faculty to consider alternatives to high-cost textbooks  
14 by adopting open educational resources (OER) of high quality that will  
15 reduce student costs; and

16  
17 **Whereas** AB 798 has created a financial and professional development incentive  
18 program to facilitate faculty development, consideration, and integration of  
19 high quality OER materials into their courses; and

20  
21 **Whereas** The State legislature has recognized the role of the faculty and senates on  
22 each campus to control all issues pertaining to curriculum, and

23  
24 **Whereas** The SJSU Senate has been actively engaged over the last decade in  
25 addressing issues pertaining to curricular and infrastructure developments  
26 that benefit our students, as evidenced by [SS-S06-5](#), “Improving Textbook  
27 Affordability and Availability”; and

28  
29 **Whereas** Support for the adoption of high-quality OER is not intended to prevent  
30 faculty from continuing to publish in the venues of their choice or from  
31 selecting course materials in the format pedagogically best suited for  
32 instruction; and

33  
34 **Whereas** AB 798 requires the support of each campus’ senates to be eligible for the  
35 incentives; therefore be it

36  
37 **Resolved** That the Academic Senate of San Jose State University affirms its support  
38 of the principles of academic freedom and the right of faculty to manage  
39 course material; and be it further

40  
41 **Resolved** That controlling the rising costs of a college education in California is a  
42 multi-faceted issue and the SJSU Academic Senate calls upon the  
43 legislature to fund the CSU at adequate levels and that we continue to  
44 advocate to restore the necessary state support for the CSU; and be it  
45 further

47 Resolved That the SJSU Academic Senate calls upon book publishers and the  
48 bookstore to commit to reducing student costs of textbooks; and be it  
49 further  
50

51 Resolved That the SJSU Academic Senate support faculty efforts to reduce student  
52 costs of attending our university and that we recognize the many faculty  
53 who have already committed the extraordinary time and effort needed to  
54 substantively develop and integrate into their courses, in a responsible  
55 manner, alternatives to high-cost materials; and be it further  
56

57 Resolved That, while acknowledging that this is only one mechanism to control the  
58 high cost of attending college, the Academic Senate supports the tenets of  
59 AB 798 and directly quotes the required legislative language calling for  
60 campuses to ““increase student access to high-quality open educational  
61 resources and reduce the cost of textbooks and supplies for students in  
62 course sections for which open educational resources are to be adopted  
63 to accomplish cost savings for students.”  
64  
65

66 Approved: May 2, 2016  
67 Vote: 7-2-6  
68 Present: Kimbarow, Blaylock, Heiden, Peter, Mathur, Larochele, Frazier,  
69 Shifflett, Kaufman, Lee, Martin, Amante, Lanning, Backer, Feinstein  
70 Absent: None  
71

72 Curricular Impact: As with the adoption of any new course materials, course curricula  
73 may need to be updated or changed to reflect faculty choices of  
74 OER materials.  
75

76 Financial Impact: If faculty choose OER materials for their courses, there will be  
77 significant cost-savings for students.  
78

79 Workload Impact: If faculty decide to use OER materials for their courses, they will  
80 need to devote significant additional time to assessing the quality of  
81 available materials, to revising their course activities and curricula,  
82 and to participating in AB 798 grant-related professional  
83 development activities. There will be additional workload for the  
84 Affordable Solutions team on campus and the Center for Faculty  
85 Development as they coordinate efforts across faculty and provide  
86 support to faculty in searching for OER materials equal to, or higher  
87 than, the quality of higher cost texts and course materials.  
88 Workload will also increase for those engaged in the review of  
89 proposals from faculty interested in this grant opportunity.  
90  
91

**Sense of the Senate Resolution  
Honoring and Thanking President Susan Martin for Her Service  
to San José State University**

Whereas, After serving as President of Eastern Michigan University for seven years, President Martin agreed to postpone her planned sabbatical to come to San José State University to serve as Interim President, and

Whereas, President Martin, her husband Dr. Larry Martin, and their puppy Teddy moved cross-country on short notice to come to San Jose, and

Whereas, President Martin took up residence in a campus apartment and lived among the students for almost three months, and

Whereas, President Martin reached out to students, faculty and staff across the campus and became a very public face of the institution, and

Whereas, through her natural, authentic, and transparent communication style, President Martin immediately improved morale among faculty, students, and staff, and

Whereas, President Martin embraced Spartan Pride and communicated a positive message about SJSU to the campus and external community, and

Whereas, President Martin saw to it that Dudley Morehead Hall would be retrofitted for air conditioning, and

Whereas, President Martin created an environment for the cabinet to work collaboratively for the benefit of the campus

Whereas, President Martin showed an amazing ability to bring a wide array of personal and professional skills to bear on campus issues in a way that repeatedly moved us forward, and

Whereas, President Martin's capacity to understand the pivotal issues when listening to the concerns of faculty, staff, students, and administrators enabled the campus to make substantive progress over the course of the year, and

- Whereas, President Martin demonstrated respect and support for shared governance and attended all Executive Committee and Senate meetings when she was able; therefore be it
- Resolved, That the SJSU Academic Senate thanks President Susan Martin for her extraordinary service to the University, and be it further
- Resolved, That we wish President Martin a much deserved peaceful and stress-free sabbatical year when she returns to Michigan, and be it further
- Resolved, That we will always remember with great appreciation all that she accomplished for the campus during her short time with us and will always consider President Martin a member of the San José State University Spartan family.

Approved: May 3, 2016  
Vote: 14-0-0  
Present: Kimbarow, Feinstein, Blaylock, Lanning, Larochelle,  
Kaufman, Heiden, Peter, Mathur, Backer, Amante, Lee,  
Frazier, Shifflett  
Absent: None

1 **San José State University**  
2 **Academic Senate**  
3 **Curriculum and Research Committee**  
4 **May 9, 2016**  
5 **Final Reading**  
6

**AS 1622**

7 **Policy Recommendation**  
8 **Academic Certificate Programs: Review and Approval Process**  
9

10 **Rescinds:** S12-5 and S13-10  
11

12 **Rationale:**

13 Executive Order #806 from the Chancellor’s office provided a framework for offering  
14 certificate programs and encouraged the development of such programs. The existing  
15 certificate policies, S12-5--Policy Recommendation, Review and Approval Process for  
16 Academic Certificate Programs and S13-10--Policy Recommendation, Modify the Review  
17 and Approval Process for Academic Certificates, provide the review and approval process  
18 for the current certificate process at SJSU (including earning certificates through Open  
19 University). As described in Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 40400 provides  
20 that the Board of Trustees, upon recommendation of the faculty of a campus, shall issue a  
21 certificate to a student who has completed the prescribed course of study. After  
22 implementation of our certificate policies in the last three years, problems have arisen with  
23 undergraduate and graduate admissions, the use of Open University within certificates, and  
24 the review process timeline of certificate proposals within committees.  
25

- 26 **Resolved:** That the following be adopted as policy; and be it further  
27 **Resolved:** That all certificate programs at San José State University must be reviewed  
28 and approved under the process outlined in the attached guidelines; and be  
29 it further  
30 **Resolved:** That, within two years, certificate programs that predate the adoption of this  
31 policy must be reviewed and approved under the attached guidelines; and be it  
32 further  
33 **Resolved:** That only certificates from approved certificate programs can be awarded  
34 and posted on transcripts.  
35

36 **Certificate Guidelines**  
37 **Types of Certificate Programs**

- 38 1) Certificate programs are defined as any program in which some form of recognition from San  
39 José State University is awarded to participants. There are two basic kinds of certificate  
40 programs, Academic and Other (defined below) but only the former is the subject of this policy.  
41 2) Academic certificate programs  
42 a) **Definition:** Certificate programs are classified as “Academic” if students receive  
43 academic credit for any courses in the program.  
44 b) Types of Academic certificate programs

- 45 i) Basic (undergraduate level)
- 46 (1) **Definition:** Basic certificate programs provide opportunities for
- 47 students to pursue specialized, often pre-professional, focused
- 48 educational objectives that may be separate from a degree program.
- 49 (2) **Jurisdiction:** Basic certificate programs are under the jurisdiction of
- 50 the Undergraduate Studies (UGS) Committee and administered by the
- 51 Office of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs (GUP).
- 52 ii) Advanced (graduate level)
- 53 (1) **Definition:** An advanced certificate program offers post-baccalaureate
- 54 students coursework leading to a specific, applied, focused goal.
- 55 (2) **Jurisdiction:** Advanced certificate programs are under the jurisdiction
- 56 of the Graduate Studies and Research (GS&R) Committee and
- 57 administered by GUP.
- 58 3) Other certificate programs
- 59 a) **Definition:** Certificate programs are classified as “Other” if no academic credit or
- 60 grade is required to be awarded for completion of courses in the program.
- 61 b) **Jurisdiction:** College of International and Extended Studies (CIES) oversees these
- 62 certificates in consultation with the AVP of GUP.
- 63

#### 64 **General Guidelines for Academic Certificate Programs**

- 65 1) Self-supporting certificate programs, both basic and advanced, credit and non-credit, will be
- 66 administered by CIES, but curricular reviews will be overseen by GUP.
- 67 2) State-support certificate programs must be credit bearing and must go through the curricular
- 68 review process overseen by GUP.
- 69 3) Academic certificate programs should establish at least one advisor or director to oversee
- 70 certificate programs within the unit.
- 71 4) Certificate programs that are classifiable as “Academic” that do not meet the criteria for this
- 72 policy must be discontinued or go through a review process prior to Fall 2018.
- 73

#### 74 **Specific to Academic Basic Certificate Programs**

##### 75 **Requirements**

- 76 1) Basic certificate programs must include a minimum of 9 units and maximum of 18 units of
- 77 coursework. Programs may require that all prerequisite coursework has been completed prior to
- 78 enrolling in the basic certificate program. At least 6 units must be completed at SJSU.
- 79 2) Basic certificate programs may include lower-division and upper-division courses numbered 1
- 80 through 199 (excluding individual studies, directed reading, supervision, and credit/no-credit
- 81 courses).
- 82 3) A clearly stated assessment plan with learning outcomes must be included in the certificate
- 83 proposal.
- 84 4) Basic certificates are available to matriculated students (regular or special session status).
- 85 5) A maximum of 33% of basic certificate units (e.g., 3 units for a 9-unit certificate) can be
- 86 completed through Open University at SJSU with approval from the department or school.
- 87 6) Unless otherwise stated in the catalog, courses taken as part of an SJSU Academic
- 88 Certificate program can be applied to an approved major, minor, or emphasis program where

89 one is required for the student's degree. Unless otherwise stated in the catalog, courses taken  
90 for a major or minor may be applied to a basic certificate program upon approval from the basic  
91 certificate program advisor/director.

92 7) Students must have a minimum GPA of 2.0 in basic certificate coursework in order to be  
93 awarded a certificate. However, departments or comparable units may elect to set more  
94 stringent standards to ensure the quality of certificate holders with respect to the program.

95 8) The advisor/director of the program is responsible for verifying a student's satisfactory  
96 completion of the academic requirements established for the program and for forwarding a copy  
97 of the certificate completion form to the Office of the Registrar. The Office of the Registrar  
98 records the completion of the program on the student's transcript.

### 99 Specific to Academic Advanced Certificate Programs

#### 100 **Requirements**

101 1) Advanced certificate programs must include a minimum of 9 units and maximum of 18 units  
102 of coursework.

103 2) Advanced certificate programs must be comprised of courses numbered 100 through  
104 296 (excluding individual studies, directed reading, supervision, and credit/no-credit  
105 courses).

106 3) A clearly stated assessment plan with learning outcomes must be included in the proposal.

107 4) With the approval of the department or school, units may be applied to both an  
108 advanced certificate program and a graduate degree program offered by the department.

109 5) All advanced certificate programs must be constructed solely with courses taken through  
110 San José State University.

111 a) Students must maintain a minimum GPA of 3.0 in all advanced certificate coursework,  
112 with no less than the grade of "C" in any course. A maximum of 4 units of coursework  
113 with a grade of "C" can count toward an advanced certificate.

114 b) A maximum of 4 units of coursework may be repeated. The grade used for the GPA  
115 for the advanced certificate is the average of the initial grade and the grade upon  
116 repeating the course.

117 c) Advanced certificates may be available to matriculated (regular or special session  
118 status) and non-matriculated students (i.e., taken through Open University).

119 d) A maximum of 30% of any graduate degree program units (e.g., 9 units for a 30-unit  
120 Master's degree) can be completed from another institution and/or units from Open  
121 University (including advanced certificate courses) at SJSU with approval from the  
122 department or school.

123 e) The choice of grading requirements may have implications for transferability to  
124 degree programs.

125 6) These guidelines constitute minimum standards for advanced certificate programs;  
126 departments may propose additional requirements for approval by the GS&R Committee.

127 7) Departments/programs offering advanced certificate programs must have their advanced  
128 certificate students complete an intake form and submit an official transcript(s) (noting the  
129 completion of a U.S. bachelor's degree from an accredited institution or the equivalent of a  
130 U.S. bachelor's degree from an accredited and/or recognized institution from a foreign country).

131 Students must have an undergraduate GPA of at least 2.5 (where A=4). A department or  
132 program can propose more restrictive requirements subject to approval by the GS&R  
133 committee.

134 a) Non-matriculated students who complete an advanced certificate program solely  
135 through Open University are required to send copies of this documentation to the CIES  
136 wherein this information will be retained and tracked by CIES. Matriculated advanced  
137 certificate students that go through a formal university admissions review will have the  
138 said documentation retained and tracked at the Graduate Admissions and Program  
139 Evaluations (GAPE) office within Enrollment Services.

140 b) Departments/programs offering advanced certificate programs may specify subject  
141 matter and/or coursework prerequisites for entrance into the certificate program. Such  
142 prerequisites must be listed in the university catalog. Prerequisite courses or equivalent  
143 experience must demonstrate current and appropriate preparation as determined by the  
144 program. All other grading regulations of the graduate school apply to the courses in the  
145 certificate programs (e.g., the prohibition against taking graded classes pass/fail).

146 c) Where appropriate, some form of portfolio presentation, performance audition, or  
147 other evidence of specific competence may be required by departments. Such criteria  
148 will also be listed in the catalog.

149 8) The advisor/director of the certificate program is responsible for verifying information in the  
150 student's intake form and the student's satisfactory completion of the academic requirements  
151 established for the program and for forwarding the certificate completion form to GAPE. After a  
152 review and evaluation, GAPE then records the completion of the program onto the student's  
153 transcript.

154

#### **Process for Proposing and Reviewing Academic Certificate Programs**

156 1) All courses in a certificate program must undergo the normal course approval process prior to  
157 approval of the certificate course package.

158 2) Proposal Content:

159 a) SJSU College Dean Curricular Proposal Approval Form(s).

160 b) Brief statement of purpose.

161 c) Clearly stated learning outcomes mapped to coursework.

162 d) Catalog copy, which includes the following:

163 i. Brief statement of purpose.

164 ii. Admissions requirements.

165 iii. Course requirements.

166 iv. Any prerequisites for the certificate program.

167 v. Total number of units.

168 e) GPA needed to receive the certificate if other than a minimum of 2.0 for basic  
169 certificates and 3.0 for advanced certificates.

170 f) Program advisor.

171 g) For advanced certificates: number of units applicable (if any) to a degree and/or major  
172 depending upon matriculation status (with the caveat that the units may not be uniformly  
173 applied but require advisor consent).

- 174 h) For advanced certificates: if students are allowed to complete certificate courses  
175 through Open University, then the department/program must provide a justification for  
176 this pathway. The justification establishes that sufficient space will be available in the  
177 courses required for the certificate program.
- 178 i. This justification must comply with Executive Order #1099 which allows OU  
179 enrollment in state-supported courses on a space available basis after enrollment  
180 opportunities have been provided to state-support matriculated students.
  - 181 ii. The justification must also comply with Executive Order #805 which states  
182 "enrollment or potential enrollment of non-matriculated students in state  
183 supported courses shall not be the basis of the addition for a course that would  
184 otherwise be cancelled because of low enrollment of regular matriculated  
185 students".
  - 186 iii. Departments/programs must go through a recertification process every 3  
187 years that re-evaluates the justification for certificate completion through Open  
188 University. These recertification requests will need approval by the college  
189 deans, the Chair of GS&R, and the Provost. GUP will oversee this recertification  
190 process.
- 191 3) Submission process
- 192 a) Academic certificate programs (either basic or advanced) may be proposed by  
193 department, school or college curriculum committees.
  - 194 b) Proposals may be submitted, reviewed, and approved at any time during the academic  
195 year.
  - 196 c) For entry into the catalog, the approval must be registered with GUP according to  
197 published catalog deadlines.
- 198 4) Review process for new proposals
- 199 The reviewing bodies are responsible for timely review and approval of academic certificate  
200 programs:
- 201 a) Proposals from either department or college level curriculum committees are  
202 submitted to the appropriate department chair(s) or school director(s) for review.
  - 203 b) Upon approval, the department or school reviews are then submitted with a copy of  
204 the proposal to the appropriate curriculum committee(s) and college dean(s) for review  
205 and approval.
  - 206 c) Upon approval of the college deans, a copy of the proposal (along with reviews from  
207 departmental/school and deans) is submitted to the Chair of the appropriate operating  
208 committee.
    - 209 i. If the program contains any 200 level courses, the materials are referred to the  
210 Chair of the GS&R Committee for review.
    - 211 ii. If the program does not contain any 200 level courses, the materials are  
212 referred to the Chair of the UGS Committee for review.
    - 213 iii. During duty days, within one week, the committee Chair will determine if the  
214 Committee needs to review the proposal. If no full committee review is required,  
215 the proposal and accompanying reviews are submitted to the Provost via the  
216 appropriate office (GS&R for programs with 200 level courses or UGS for

217 proposals with 100 level programs) with a statement from the Chair specifying  
218 that a review from their committee was not necessary.

219 d) If review by the appropriate operating committee is necessary, the Chair of the  
220 operating committee will send recommendations from the committees, along with the  
221 proposal and accompanying reviews, to the Provost via the GUP office (GS&R for  
222 programs with 200 level courses or UGS for proposals with 100 level programs).

223 e) The Provost makes the final decision on whether or not to approve the certificate  
224 program.

225 5) Review process for existing certificate programs

226 a) Substitution, deletion, or addition of courses to the program will need to go through the  
227 minor program change process in the GUP office.

228 b) Certificates involving multiple programs will be assigned to a home department under  
229 which to be reviewed.

230

231 **Approved (C&R):** May 5, 2016 (electronic vote)

232 **Vote:** 11-0-0

233 **Present:** Anagnos, Bacich, Backer, Buzanski, Clements, Heil, Mathur, Matoush,  
234 Schultz-Krohn, Sibley, Stacks

235 **Absent:** Sarras

236

237 **Financial Impact:** Certificate programs have the potential to increase revenue if students  
238 enroll through special session.

239

240 **Workload Impact:** As certificate programs are developed or adopted:

241 1. The development of certificate proposals will require one faculty  
242 member to oversee each program.

243 2. Proposals will increase the number of materials for review and  
244 approval for curriculum committees, Chairs/Directors, Deans, UGS or  
245 GS&R, and the GUP office.

246 3. CMS and Enrollment Services may have increased workload to  
247 matriculate certificate students.

7  
8  
9 **Sense of the Senate Resolution**  
10 **Calling for Widespread Consultation**  
11 **Prior to Finalizing any Standards and/or Implementation Strategies**  
12 **Pertaining to Electronic Communications**  
13

14 Resolved: That, prior to finalizing any standards and/or implementation strategies  
15 pertaining to electronic communications, the Information Security Officer  
16 share widely with faculty, staff, administrators and students the draft  
17 standard on Email and Campus Communication  
18 ([http://its.sjsu.edu/docs/security/Standard\\_Email\\_Campus\\_Communication.](http://its.sjsu.edu/docs/security/Standard_Email_Campus_Communication.pdf)  
19 [pdf](http://its.sjsu.edu/docs/security/Standard_Email_Campus_Communication.pdf)) and solicit input on revisions, and be it further  
20

21 Resolved: That following campus consultation, a revised draft of the standard on Email  
22 and Campus Communication be shared with the Senate's Professional  
23 Standards Committee to guide their development of a policy  
24 recommendation.  
25

26 Rationale: The draft standards on email campus communication contain numerous  
27 important changes that would substantially alter how faculty, students, and staff  
28 communicate through electronic media at SJSU. Some of those changes may be  
29 inconvenient or controversial. It would be prudent to solicit the widest possible feedback  
30 in order to devise the least disruptive implementation, and to determine if the campus  
31 community can suggest alternatives or improvements to the Standard Email Campus  
32 Communication plan.  
33

34 Approved: February 16, 2016 in a different format (part of a larger package) by  
35 Organization and Government

36 Vote: 8-0-0

37 Present: Mathur, Shifflett, Beyersdorf, Becker, Romero, Laker, Curry,  
38 Grosvenor

39 Absent: Gleixner  
40

41  
42 Approved: March 21, 2016 by Professional Standards

43 Vote: 8-0-0

44 Present: Peter, Green, White, Lee, Virick, Kauppila, Sandoval-Rios,  
45 Hamedi-Hagh

46 Absent: Riley

47 Financial Impact: No changes over the previous policy.

48 Workload Impact: Will require some workload as the Information Security Officer will  
49 need to devise and implement a campus wide consultation plan.

6  
7 **Policy Recommendation**  
8 **Probation and Disqualification**

9 Whereas University Policy S10-6 has already been amended twice (S11-1 and S15-5) and  
10 now would require many further amendments to become consistent with policies  
11 such as F12-7 (Former Students Returning), Academic Disqualification and  
12 Reinstatement Review Committee (ADRRC) Guidelines on Probation and  
13 Disqualification in the Major, and changes in ADRRC implementation of  
14 reinstatement criteria; therefore be it

15 Resolved That University Policies S10-6, S11-1, and S15-5 be rescinded and replaced by  
16 the following policy.

17 **Table of Contents**

- 18  
19 I. [Undergraduate Students](#)  
20 A. [University Academic Probation and Continued Probation](#)  
21 B. [University Academic Disqualification](#)  
22 C. [Reinstatement following Academic Disqualification](#)  
23 D. [Administrative Academic Probation and Disqualification](#)  
24  
25 II. [Graduate, Post-baccalaureate, and Credential Students](#)  
26 A1. [University Academic Probation and Continued Probation](#)  
27 A2. [Completion of all Degree or Credential Requirements While on Probation](#)  
28 B. [University Academic Disqualification](#)  
29 C. [Reinstatement following Academic Disqualification](#)  
30 D. [Administrative Academic Probation and Disqualification](#)  
31  
32 III. [Appeal of Administrative Academic Probation or Disqualification](#)  
33 A. [Student Appeal Filing](#)  
34 B. [Validity of Appeal](#)  
35 C. [Subcommittee Structure](#)  
36 D. [Hearing Rules](#)  
37 E. [Decisions](#)  
38

## 39 **I. Undergraduate Students**

40 Per Sections 41300 and 41300.1 Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, undergraduate  
41 students studying for a baccalaureate degree are expected to maintain a grade point average  
42 (GPA) of 2.0 or better in their academic work at SJSU in order to be classified as being in good  
43 academic standing. In determining a student's eligibility to remain enrolled at SJSU, both  
44 quality of performance and progress toward the degree or other program objective are  
45 weighed. Quality of performance is determined by the GPA in all letter-graded courses. Other  
46 factors, such as the total number of units taken, the number of courses repeated, or the GPA  
47 in the major may be considered in determining progress toward degree or other degree  
48 program objectives.

### 49 **A. University Academic Probation and Continued Probation**

50 Undergraduate students will be placed on academic probation if at any time (following a  
51 Fall, Winter, Spring, or Summer term) their SJSU cumulative GPA falls below 2.0. The  
52 probation status is shown on the transcript.

53 Undergraduate students on probation will remain on continued probation when the  
54 following term GPA is 2.0 or better, while the SJSU cumulative GPA remains below 2.0.  
55 The continued probation status is shown on the transcript and is treated like probation in  
56 terms of academic standing.

57 Freshmen on academic probation are allowed a second consecutive semester of probation  
58 (known as continued probation) if the SJSU cumulative GPA is in the range 1.50 to 1.99.

59 The Registrar will notify students who are placed on probation of that fact when term  
60 grades are posted. The notification will include a referral of the students to their advisors  
61 for consultation. Undergraduate students on academic probation may have restrictions  
62 placed on their total unit load.

63 Undergraduate students on probation or continued probation will have holds placed on their  
64 records and will not be allowed to participate in further registration activity until they have  
65 conferred with their major advisors to design a study plan to raise their GPA to at least 2.0  
66 in the most expeditious manner. The registration hold will continue until the student  
67 achieves clearance from probation.

68 Undergraduate students will remain on probation or continued probation until they are  
69 removed from probation or are disqualified. They are removed from probation and returned  
70 to good standing when the SJSU cumulative GPA is raised to at least 2.0 (following a Fall,  
71 Winter, Spring, or Summer term).

### 72 **B. University Academic Disqualification**

73 Undergraduate students on probation or continued probation will be academically  
74 disqualified when the term GPA for a Fall or Spring semester is below 2.0. The disqualified  
75 status is shown on the transcript.

76

77 **C. Reinstatement following Academic Disqualification**

78 Undergraduate students disqualified from the university can petition to be reinstated.  
79 Reinstatement is a process separate from readmission. Readmission requires  
80 reapplication via CSU Mentor. University Policy F12-7 provides a mechanism to give  
81 Former Students Returning (FSRs) priority for readmission as upper-division transfers.  
82 This is a separate petition process with its own deadlines distinct from those pertaining to  
83 CSU Mentor application deadlines and to reinstatement petition deadlines.

84 The reinstatement petition and FSR petition processes include department and college-  
85 level approvals. Reinstatement on probation requires, additionally, the signature of the  
86 Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies. For undergraduates, reinstatement into the  
87 university does not guarantee reinstatement into the previous major. Undergraduate  
88 students who do not obtain department or college-level approval for reinstatement into their  
89 previous majors may petition for reinstatement into new majors or into an undeclared  
90 status. The ADRRC is charged with establishing and evaluating the guidelines for  
91 reinstatement.

92 There are four categories available for petitioning for reinstatement as an undergraduate  
93 student:

94 **1. Raising the SJSU Cumulative GPA to 2.0 or Better.** Generally, the SJSU cumulative  
95 GPA is raised through SJSU Open University coursework, although retroactive (after  
96 the last day of classes) actions by students, such as completion of Incomplete (“I”)  
97 grades or course drops, can also raise the SJSU cumulative GPA.

98 **2. Extenuating Circumstances.** Reinstatements in this category will be granted only for  
99 serious and compelling circumstances that were clearly beyond a student’s control and  
100 are clearly documented in the petition. The criteria for approval under this category are  
101 similar to those required for a retroactive (course) drop or retroactive (semester)  
102 withdrawal. Sometimes the approval of such retroactive petitions will raise the SJSU  
103 cumulative GPA to 2.0 or better (good academic standing), thus shifting to a Category 1  
104 approval. However, even in such cases, rescinding academic standing already posted  
105 to the record is very rarely approved.

106 **3. Special Consideration.** This category is reserved for students whose petitions cannot  
107 be accommodated within the other categories. Typically, such students have spent  
108 substantial time (five years or more) away from SJSU since their disqualification and  
109 can demonstrate that their life experiences have prepared them for a successful return  
110 to school. Students disqualified while in the lower division may be reinstated and  
111 readmitted in fewer than five years. Generally, students must be eligible for  
112 readmission on probation prior to approval under this category. Multiple reinstatements  
113 under this category are rarely granted.

114 **4. Petitioned Grade Change.** This category is reserved for changes in grade approved  
115 under Section III (Grade Appeal) and Section IV (Change of Grade) of University Policy  
116 S09-7. If a timely grade change results in an increase in the term GPA or in the SJSU  
117 cumulative GPA to 2.0 or better, the student may qualify, not only for reinstatement  
118 under this category, but also for the rescinding of the academic standing of probation or

119 disqualification (meaning that the academic standing is removed from the transcript).  
120 The rationale for the rescinding of academic standing is that the instructor and not the  
121 student made the error that led to an incorrect posting of academic standing. Generally,  
122 the grade change must be made by the Drop Deadline of the following Fall or Spring  
123 semester. Further extension of this deadline will be considered only when there is  
124 documentation of the student's attempt(s) to contact the instructor and/or the  
125 department chair, and the late submission of the change of grade form is clearly beyond  
126 the student's control, as described in University Policy S09-7.

127 Reinstatement of undergraduates following a second disqualification must generally be  
128 done under Category 1.

#### 129 **D. Administrative Academic Probation and Disqualification**

130 Per Sections 41300.1 Title 5, "An undergraduate... student may also be placed on  
131 probation or may be disqualified by appropriate campus authorities for unsatisfactory  
132 scholastic progress regardless of cumulative grade point average or progress points. Such  
133 actions shall be limited to those arising from repeated withdrawal, failure to progress toward  
134 an educational objective and noncompliance with an academic requirement..."

135 Limitations. As with academic probation and disqualification, administrative academic  
136 probation must precede administrative academic disqualification in all but the most  
137 exceptional circumstances (see below). In most cases, a direct reassignment from good  
138 standing in the major to disqualification from the major is prohibited. In other words, at  
139 least one semester of probation in the major is required prior to disqualification from the  
140 major. The underlying philosophical premise is that students should be placed on notice  
141 prior to disqualification.

142 Transcript Notation. Both administrative academic probation and administrative academic  
143 disqualification status may be shown on the transcript, but rarely will this happen. Negative  
144 service indicators attached to a student's electronic record can effectively manage  
145 everything from mandatory advising to restricted enrollment, and should be the routine  
146 mechanism for managing administrative academic probation and administrative academic  
147 disqualification. If a transcript notation is warranted, then the Associate Dean of  
148 Undergraduate Studies makes final decisions about rescinding administrative academic  
149 transcript notations. These decisions may be appealed to the ADRRC (see Section III of  
150 this policy).

151 **Academic Progress in the Major**<sup>1</sup>. Most instances of administrative academic probation  
152 and disqualification result from probation and disqualification in the major.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> **Definition of Major.** For the purposes of this policy, "major" means a unique degree program. Specifically, each individual concentration is a degree program. For example, there is only one individual type of baccalaureate degree in the College of Business, the B.S., Business Administration. There are, however, multiple concentrations, many of which have different criteria related to probation and disqualification, change of major, and (re)admission to the major. Each of these concentrations is treated as its own major.

<sup>2</sup> **Supporting Student Success.** Although it may seem harsh to disqualify students from the majors of their choice, in many instances, students will be well served by such departmental policies. For example, there are many students who barely progress through their major degree programs, only to discover when they are high

153 Despite maintaining a SJSU cumulative GPA of 2.0 or better, an undergraduate student's  
154 academic performance in the major may fall below the minimum standards for that major.  
155 In these cases, while the student remains in overall good standing with the university, he or  
156 she is subject to administrative-academic probation in and disqualification from the major.  
157 Each college, school, department, and program (hereafter referred to as "program") may  
158 employ program-specific criteria for determining a policy of probation in, disqualification  
159 from, and reinstatement into the major. These criteria must be reviewed and approved by  
160 the ADRRC.

161 Notification. Undergraduate programs must ensure that all students within the concerned  
162 majors are advised of these program-level criteria and the consequences of being placed  
163 on Administrative Academic Probation or Disqualification. At a minimum, criteria in addition  
164 to or differing from university regulations must be posted on departmental and/or program  
165 websites and any other program documents, such as student handbooks.

## 166 **Probation in the Major and Disqualification from the Major.**

### 167 **1. Probation in the Major**

168 Undergraduate students may be placed on probation in the major when their cumulative  
169 GPA in the major falls below 2.0. The GPA in the major is generally defined by the  
170 section of the catalog labeled Requirements of the Major, but for the purposes of this  
171 policy major GPA may be specified to include courses in Preparation for the Major.  
172 SJSU and non-SJSU courses should be considered.

173 Departments and schools must notify students in writing of (new) probation in the major  
174 or disqualification from the major status no later than two weeks following the posting of  
175 university academic standing. They must also be provided with the conditions for  
176 release from administrative academic probation and the circumstances that would lead  
177 to administrative academic disqualification should probation not be cleared. There  
178 should be a mechanism to permit return to good standing from probation.

179 Undergraduate students must be advised to meet with an advisor in the major to design  
180 a study plan to raise their GPA in the major to 2.0 in the next semester of enrollment.

### 181 **2. Disqualification from the Major**

182 If undergraduate students on probation in the major fail to achieve a minimum term GPA  
183 of 2.0 in the major during a subsequent Fall or Spring semester, they may be  
184 disqualified from the major. Departments and/or colleges must notify the Registrar's

---

unit seniors that they are unable to complete key upper-division or capstone courses, or they have major GPAs well below 2.0 even though their SJSU GPAs are above 2.0. It is better for students to discover early in their degree work that either they need to demonstrate improvement in courses leading to the major or they should find another major more suited to their talents and interests. All policies developed to be consistent with this policy will still require advising and student support structures (tutoring, counseling, etc.) to function as intended. Probation and disqualification in the major, at its best, can provide a mechanism to compel struggling students to recognize areas for improvement, successfully negotiate hurdles, and get back on track. Alternatively, such policies can help students realize early in their academic careers that they should be exploring other majors and possible careers prior to spending a great deal of time and money pursuing a major that is a poor fit. In summary, well-designed and well-implemented policies for probation and disqualification in the major will be beneficial as an early warning system for students and enhance retention and graduation efforts more generally.

185 Office.

186 Students disqualified under this policy will be notified by the program that they are no  
187 longer eligible to continue in the major and that their major will be changed to  
188 undeclared unless another major for which they are qualified is selected. Notification  
189 will include a referral of the students to their advisors for consultation.

### 190 3. Guidelines and Criteria for Programmatic Probation and Disqualification

191 Maximum Course Grade or GPA Requirements. Programs may not require individual  
192 course grades to be higher than "C" for undergraduates. At the most, a department  
193 may require that each and every course required for the degree program be passed at  
194 this standard. The corollary is that the maximum GPA that can be required for any set  
195 of courses cannot be higher than 2.0 for undergraduates. Related to these general  
196 guidelines are the following stipulations:

- 197 a. Admission requirements and degree requirements are different. Admission to an  
198 impacted degree program may include supplemental criteria such as a GPA  
199 greater than the 2.0 threshold. However, once a student is admitted to a major,  
200 the degree requirements must be limited to "C or better" for undergraduates (Title  
201 5).
- 202 b. Following a disqualification from the major, reinstatement to the major may  
203 include course grades or GPA requirements higher than the standard thresholds.  
204 In effect, students seeking such reinstatements are being admitted to the major  
205 again and may be held to higher standards than are required to complete a  
206 degree. This is especially appropriate for impacted majors that already apply  
207 supplemental criteria for admission of new students to the major.

208 **Restrictions on Course or Unit Load Per Semester.** Programs may restrict a student  
209 to two attempts of any course offered by the program. The basic guideline is that the  
210 university rules for repeating courses should be followed unless the program chooses to  
211 be more lenient than the university. These parameters may be set as a minimum or  
212 maximum. For example, cohort programs may require that a minimum number of  
213 courses/units be taken each semester in order to best utilize resources or to ensure that  
214 the program is completed while student knowledge is still current. Alternatively, setting  
215 a maximum number of units may make sense for students on probation in the major.  
216 Special situations include the following:

- 217 a. Approved course drops or semester withdrawals (W grades) are considered to  
218 be without prejudice and should not be counted as an attempt at a course if the  
219 program restricts the number of attempts of a course (per University Policy S09-  
220 7).
- 221 b. If grade forgiveness is allowed (undergraduates only), then the repeat grade  
222 must be considered without prejudice (as implicit in University Policy F08-2).
- 223 c. If grade forgiveness is not possible when a course is attempted multiple times,  
224 the university will use grade averaging in computing the SJSU GPA (per

225 University Policy F08-2). A program may also do this or may consider the final  
226 attempt at the course or the highest grade in the course for the purposes of the  
227 major GPA or to satisfy any requirements prior to completion of the major.

- 228 d. If the course in question is offered by another department, the program may  
229 consider only the first two attempts in determining probation or disqualification  
230 status. Clearly, the major department cannot restrict the number of times a  
231 student enrolls in a course offered by another department, but it is permitted, for  
232 instance, to ignore the grade from a third attempt to pass a class with a C or  
233 better.

234 **Exceptions.** Exceptions to the rule that administrative academic disqualification must  
235 be preceded by a probationary period may be made in the following cases:

- 236 a. In clinical courses, laboratory courses, or other types of programmatic  
237 requirements, there may be such serious concerns about the safety or well-being  
238 of the student or other students, clients, patients, etc., that repetition of the  
239 course is not reasonable. For such courses or programmatic experiences,  
240 departments may establish “no repeat” policies, i.e., a course may not be  
241 repeated if not passed on the first attempt. The course catalog description,  
242 course syllabus, and programmatic information must all clearly provide this  
243 information. In clinical or lab settings in which safety or well-being are severely  
244 compromised, an instructor may disenroll a student from the course, which may  
245 lead to disqualification from the major. In general, the immediate move from  
246 good standing to disqualification (without a term of probation in between) should  
247 be associated with the inability to satisfy a specific course requirement on the  
248 first and only allowable attempt, not with a less specific programmatic  
249 requirement.
- 250 b. There may even be time limits or unit limits established to satisfy certain  
251 conditions, which, if not met, may lead to disqualification from the major degree  
252 program without an intervening term on probation. Cohort programs must  
253 provide in their policies a reasonable accommodation for students who must stop  
254 out for legitimate reasons.

255 Programs may consider university probation or disqualification as a factor in  
256 determining probation in or disqualification from the major.

#### 257 **4. Reinstatement to the Major**

258 Programs employing a policy for disqualification from the major may have a procedure  
259 or set of conditions for reinstatement of those students into the major. Conditions for  
260 reinstatement should be clearly communicated to students at the time they are  
261 disqualified. If it is not possible to be reinstated after a programmatic disqualification,  
262 which is a programmatic option, then that too must be communicated. Conditions for  
263 reinstatement from administrative academic disqualification, if it is to be allowed, should  
264 be stringent enough that students return to the major in good standing as opposed to  
265 being reinstated on probation.

266 A critical step in achieving reinstatement to the major following disqualification from the  
267 major is consultation by students with their advisors to design a study plan that  
268 addresses scholastic deficiencies and demonstrates that they are ready to resume  
269 rigorous academic work.

## 270 **5. Petitions**

271 In cases of error or extenuating circumstances, upon receiving notice of administrative  
272 academic probation or disqualification, students may petition to an appropriate faculty  
273 committee at the program level or to the department chair/school director to appeal  
274 such action. In the case of a negative decision in response to the petition, students may  
275 appeal to the ADRRC, the process for which is described in Section III below. After  
276 review of the petition, the ADRRC will make a recommendation to the Associate Dean  
277 of Undergraduate Studies to confirm or rescind the action.

## 278 **II. Graduate, Post-baccalaureate, and Credential Students**

### 279 **A1. University Academic Probation and Continued Probation**

280 Graduate and post-baccalaureate teaching credential candidates will be placed on  
281 academic probation if at any time (following a Fall, Winter, Spring, or Summer term) their  
282 SJSU cumulative GPA falls below 3.0. The probation status is shown on the transcript.

283 Graduate students and credential candidates on probation will remain on continued  
284 probation when the following term GPA is 3.0 or better, while the SJSU cumulative GPA  
285 remains below 3.0. The continued probation status is shown on the transcript and is  
286 treated like probation in terms of academic standing.

287 Distinction between SJSU Cum GPA (as shown on the transcript) and GPA for the degree  
288 program (as shown on the candidacy form). All upper-division (100 level) and graduate-  
289 level (200 level) courses, including SJSU Open University courses taken as a post-  
290 baccalaureate, will be used in the calculation of SJSU cumulative GPA. Courses from  
291 other institutions and courses from the SJSU undergraduate career will not be counted in  
292 the graduate SJSU cumulative GPA. In addition, the GPA among all of the courses that  
293 appear on the candidacy form (count toward the degree) must also be a minimum of 3.0  
294 for degree conferral. SJSU courses taken at the lower-division level (numbered below 100)  
295 will be shown on the student transcript but cannot be used to satisfy graduate degree  
296 requirements and will not be included in the graduate student GPA calculations.

297 The Registrar will notify students who are placed on academic probation of that fact when  
298 term grades are posted. The students will also be advised of conditions required for return  
299 to good standing, the consequences of not maintaining a term GPA of 3.0, and the  
300 necessity of conferring with their graduate advisor

301 Graduate and credential candidates will remain on probation or continued probation until  
302 they are removed from probation or are disqualified. They are removed from probation and  
303 returned to good standing when the SJSU cumulative GPA is raised to at least 3.0  
304 (following a Fall, Winter, Spring, or Summer term).

305 **A2. Completion of all Degree or Credential Requirements While on Probation**

306 Should the SJSU cumulative GPA fall below 3.0 at the same time that the candidacy GPA  
307 is above 3.0, the student's academic standing will reflect the former only. In this unusual  
308 circumstance, the student or program must make the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies  
309 aware of this discrepancy. He or she will rescind the academic standing by contacting the  
310 Registrar, and the student record will be altered to "good standing." Enrollment in at least  
311 one letter-graded course is required of graduate students in each Fall and Spring semester  
312 that they are on academic probation.

313 If a graduate student does not complete the graduate degree program with the minimum  
314 3.0 GPA in the candidacy coursework (thus in all degree requirements), his or her major  
315 department may terminate the candidacy or permit completing additional courses in an  
316 attempt to raise the GPA in the program to the 3.0 threshold. When the student's major  
317 department recommends the latter, 30% of the total units in the major may be added to the  
318 candidacy form, but this total is for the entire duration of the graduate career. The  
319 additional courses can be ones already taken or courses to substitute for elective courses  
320 on the candidacy form. Note that the original grade, even with a substitution, cannot be  
321 eliminated but instead is counted in GPA calculations along with the new grade. Any  
322 course with a grade less than a "B" may be repeated at the graduate level, but no more  
323 than 9 units in the graduate career, no matter the number of units required in the degree  
324 program, can be repeated per University Policy F08-2.

325 Failure to raise the candidacy and SJSU cumulative GPA to 3.0 after completing these  
326 additional courses(s) will result in a termination of the student's candidacy and an inability  
327 to earn the graduate degree.

328 Credential candidates who fail to achieve a 3.0 GPA upon completion of the credential  
329 program will be precluded by the department from attempting additional coursework and  
330 therefore not be recommended for an award of a credential by the State of California.

331 **B. University Academic Disqualification**

332 Graduate students on probation or continued probation will be academically disqualified  
333 when the term GPA for a Fall, Winter, Spring, or Summer term is below 3.0. The  
334 disqualified status is shown on the transcript.

335 **C. Reinstatement following Academic Disqualification**

336 Graduate students disqualified from the university for the first time can petition to be  
337 reinstated, unless otherwise disallowed by an accrediting body or other governing agency.  
338 Reinstatement is a process separate from readmission. Students must file an application  
339 for readmission with CSU Mentor to register for classes following reinstatement.  
340 Application for readmission can be done during the semester in which the program of study  
341 is underway or in which the reinstatement petition is being considered.

342 A graduate student may petition for reinstatement on the basis of any of the following five  
343 categories:

344 **1. Raising the SJSU Cumulative GPA to 3.0 or Better.** The SJSU cumulative GPA can  
345 be raised through SJSU Open University coursework as part of a Program of Study (see  
346 below), although retroactive (after the last day of classes) actions by students, such as  
347 completion of Incomplete (“I”) grades or course drops, can also raise the SJSU  
348 cumulative GPA.

349 **2. Extenuating Circumstances.** Reinstatements in this category will be granted only for  
350 serious and compelling circumstances that were clearly beyond a student’s control and  
351 are clearly documented in the petition. The criteria for approval under this category are  
352 similar to those required for a retroactive (course) drop or retroactive (semester)  
353 withdrawal. Sometimes the approval of such retroactive petitions will raise the SJSU  
354 cumulative GPA to 3.0 or better (good academic standing), thus shifting to a Category 1  
355 approval. However, even in such cases, rescinding academic standing already posted  
356 to the record is very rarely approved.

357 **3. Special Consideration.** This category is reserved for students whose petitions cannot  
358 be accommodated within the other categories. Such students will have spent  
359 substantial time (five years or more) away from SJSU since their disqualification and  
360 can demonstrate that their life experiences have prepared them for a successful return  
361 to school. Often this request is accompanied by a change of major from that in which  
362 the disqualification occurred.

363 Because this category of reinstatement exists to give students a fresh start on their  
364 degree pursuit, past grades that led to the previous disqualification should not hinder a  
365 student’s progress through the newly begun degree program. Circumstances could  
366 exist in which the original scholastic performance was so poor that, even with excellent  
367 progress through the new degree program, the GPA could not be returned to a 3.0  
368 level. Therefore, the previous grades should not be counted against the student. This  
369 can be effected by means of a Disregard of All Previous Graduate Coursework Petition.  
370 The corollary to this benefit is that none of the disregarded coursework may be used in  
371 the new degree program; however, satisfaction of the graduate-level Graduation Writing  
372 Assessment Requirement (GWAR) would carry over to the new program. By the same  
373 token, no courses from any source may be transferred into the new degree program.

374 **4. Petitioned Grade Change.** This category is reserved for changes in grade approved  
375 under Section III (Grade Appeal) and Section IV (Change of Grade) of University Policy  
376 S09-7. If a timely grade change results in an increase in the term GPA or in the SJSU  
377 cumulative GPA to 3.0 or better, the student may qualify not only for reinstatement  
378 under this category, but also for the rescinding of the academic standing of probation or  
379 disqualification (meaning that the academic standing is removed from the transcript).  
380 The rationale for the rescinding of academic standing is that the instructor and not the  
381 student made the error that led to an incorrect posting of academic standing. Generally,  
382 grade change must be made by the Drop Deadline of the following Fall or Spring  
383 semester. Further extension of this deadline will be considered only when there is  
384 documentation of the student’s attempt(s) to contact the instructor and/or the  
385 department chair, and the late submission of the change of grade form is clearly beyond  
386 the student’s control, as described in University Policy S09-7.

387 **5. Program of Study.** A graduate student must confer with his or her graduate advisor to  
388 develop a schedule of classes appropriate to the student's major. The courses must  
389 consist of a minimum of 6 units per term, and all must be taken in a single term. They  
390 must be letter graded, upper division (100-level), and taken through the SJSU Open  
391 University or SJSU's Extended Studies winter or summer session. The 100-level  
392 courses may or may not be part of the graduation requirements for the student's degree  
393 program. The advisor may require more than 6 units of coursework but no more than 9  
394 units. Graduate (200-level) courses are not permitted in the program of study, and  
395 disqualified students cannot enroll in 200-level courses. Courses taken prior to  
396 approval of the program of study via submission of the Graduate Petition for  
397 Reinstatement will not be accepted. Also precluded from the program of study are  
398 courses taken at another university, 300-level, 400-level, or 500-level courses, and  
399 lower-division courses. If the student plans to pursue a different degree program upon  
400 readmission to the university, the program of study must be applicable to the new major,  
401 be developed in conjunction with the graduate advisor of the new major, and  
402 demonstrate the student's capacity to complete the new graduate degree requirements.  
403 If a course on an approved program of study becomes unavailable, another  
404 reinstatement petition must be submitted and approved immediately after enrollment in  
405 a substitute course. Once the program of study has been completed successfully with a  
406 minimum GPA of 3.3 ("B+") and no grades lower than B, he or she will be reinstated  
407 and, after reapplication to the university, readmitted to the university and the  
408 department. Should the student fail to achieve the 3.3 minimum GPA, additional  
409 programs of study are permissible with entirely new classes and consent of the  
410 graduate advisor of the incoming major.

411 Reinstatement is not allowed for a second disqualification. Unless extenuating  
412 circumstances can be cited that result in rescinding the second disqualification, a Graduate  
413 Petition for Reinstatement will not be accepted from students who have been disqualified  
414 more than once.

415 Graduate students reinstated following university disqualification normally return on  
416 probation. Subsequently, they must achieve an SJSU term GPA of 3.0 or better each  
417 semester following readmission until their cumulative SJSU GPA is 3.0 or better. Failure to  
418 attain a minimum SJSU term GPA of 3.0 will result in a second and final disqualification.

#### 419 **D. Administrative Academic Probation and Disqualification**

420 Per Sections 41300.1 Title 5, "... [A] graduate student may also be placed on probation or  
421 may be disqualified by appropriate campus authorities for unsatisfactory scholastic  
422 progress regardless of cumulative grade point average or progress points. Such actions  
423 shall be limited to those arising from repeated withdrawal, failure to progress toward an  
424 educational objective and noncompliance with an academic requirement..."

425 Limitations. As with academic probation and disqualification, administrative academic  
426 probation must precede administrative academic disqualification in all but the most  
427 exceptional circumstances (see below). In most cases, a direct reassignment from good  
428 standing in the major to disqualification from the major is prohibited. In other words, at  
429 least one semester of probation in the major is required prior to disqualification from the  
430 major. The underlying philosophical premise is that students should be placed on notice

431 prior to disqualification. For example, a substandard grade in one course could not result in  
432 disqualification; rather, the student would be put on administrative academic probation and  
433 afforded the opportunity to repeat that class. Passage of the repeated course with the  
434 required grade would result in the return of the student to good standing. Programs can  
435 limit the number of semesters on probation in the student career to as few as one.

436 Transcript Notation. For graduate students, only administrative academic disqualification  
437 (not administrative academic probation) status should be noted on the transcript.

438 **Academic Progress in the Major**<sup>3</sup>. Most instances of administrative academic probation  
439 and disqualification result from probation in and disqualification from the major.<sup>4</sup>

440 Despite maintaining a SJSU cumulative GPA of 3.0 or better, a graduate student's  
441 academic performance in the major may fall below the minimum standards established in  
442 that major. In these cases, while students remain in overall good standing with the  
443 university, they are subject to probation in and disqualification from the graduate major. As  
444 with undergraduate programs, each college, school, department, and program (hereafter  
445 referred to as "program") may employ a policy of probation in, disqualification from, and  
446 reinstatement into the graduate major. The criteria must be reviewed and approved by the  
447 ADRRC.

448 Notification. Graduate programs must ensure that all students within the concerned majors  
449 are advised of these program-level criteria. At a minimum, criteria in addition to or differing  
450 from university regulations must be posted on departmental and/or program websites and  
451 any other program documents, such as student handbooks.

## 452 **Probation in the Major and Disqualification from the Major**

### 453 **1. Probation in the Major**

454 Departments and schools must notify students in writing of (new) probation in the major  
455 or disqualification from the major status no later than two weeks following the posting of  
456 university academic standing. They must also be provided with the conditions for  
457 release from administrative academic probation and the circumstances that would lead  
458 to administrative academic disqualification should probation not be cleared. There  
459 should be a mechanism to permit return to good standing from probation. Graduate

---

<sup>3</sup> **Definition of Major.** For the purposes of this policy, "major" means a unique degree program. Specifically, each individual concentration is a degree program. For example, there is only one type of M.S. degree offered by the Department of Biological Sciences, that being the M.S., Biological Sciences. There are, however, multiple concentrations which may have different criteria related to probation and disqualification. Each of these concentrations is treated as its own major.

<sup>4</sup> **Supporting Student Success.** These guidelines protect the integrity of the university and of the discipline, which is imperative for those students remaining in the degree program, the employers who hire our graduates, and the faculty who provide oversight of the academic program. A high level of scholarship and of ethical and operational behavior is needed at the graduate level, and individual programs are given some leeway in developing standards for their programs that meet the needs of the community they are serving as well as the field of study in which the students will be claiming expertise. As with undergraduates, probation in the graduate program alerts students that their performance is less than satisfactory. The limited duration and resource-intensive nature of graduate programs and the expectation for a consistently high level academic performance from graduate students may require additional policies regarding satisfactory academic progress.

460 students must be advised to meet with an advisor in the major to design a study plan to  
461 return to good standing in the major. When administrative-academic probation occurs,  
462 students will be notified of the reasons in writing by the program with copies delivered to  
463 the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies and the Registrar.

## 464 **2. Disqualification from the Major**

465 When administrative academic disqualification occurs, students will be notified of the  
466 reasons in writing by the program with copies delivered to the Associate Dean of  
467 Graduate Studies and the Registrar. Disqualification from the major will be determined  
468 after every Fall, Winter, Spring, or Summer term.

469 The reinstatement process includes department and college-level approval.  
470 Reinstatement into the university does not guarantee reinstatement into the previous  
471 major. Graduate students who do not obtain department or college-level approval for  
472 reinstatement into their previous majors may petition for reinstatement into new majors.  
473 Unlike undergraduates, graduate students cannot be “undeclared” or “programless,” i.e.,  
474 they must obtain approval from some program to be reinstated. Reinstated students  
475 cannot be denied admission on the basis of their lack of good standing. The ADRRC is  
476 charged with establishing and evaluating the guidelines for reinstatement.

## 477 **3. Guidelines and Criteria for Programmatic Probation and Disqualification<sup>5</sup>**

478 **Qualifying or Comprehensive Exams.** In programs in which qualifying or  
479 comprehensive exams must be passed, policies governing exam procedure, for  
480 example, with regard to the number of times the exams may be attempted, must be  
481 formulated and publicized by the programs.

482 **Maximum Course Grade or GPA Requirements.** Programs may not require individual  
483 course grades to be higher than “B” for graduate students. At the most, a department  
484 may require that each course required for the degree program be passed at this  
485 standard. The corollary is that the maximum GPA that can be required for any set of  
486 courses cannot be higher than 3.0 for graduate students.

487 Admission requirements and degree requirements are different. Admission to a  
488 graduate degree program may include supplemental criteria such as a GPA greater  
489 than the 3.0 threshold. However, once a student is admitted to a major, the degree  
490 requirements must be limited to “B or better” for graduate students (Title 5).

---

<sup>5</sup> **Examples.** Among the standards that a program might make mandatory is the achievement of grades of “B” in every class or in particular classes with a stipulated number of repetitions permitted. Similarly, an acceptable standard would be to require a “CR” in field, student teaching, or internship courses with a stipulated number of “NC” grades allowed for repetition. In addition, graduate students are expected to make reasonable progress through their degree program. One cannot, for example, have been admitted to one program but take no courses in it while taking courses in a second program. Usually graduate students must successfully form a master’s or doctoral committee. While the program should make every attempt to aid a student in forming a committee, the inability to do so would be grounds for dismissal from the program. Repeated failure to complete a project or thesis research proposal would constitute reasonable justification for disqualifying a student.

491 **Restrictions on Course or Unit Load Per Semester.** Programs may restrict a student  
492 to two attempts of any course offered by the program. The basic guideline is that the  
493 university rules for repeating courses should be followed unless the program chooses to  
494 be more lenient than the university. These sorts of criteria may be set as a minimum or  
495 maximum. For example, cohort programs may require that a minimum number of  
496 courses/units be taken each semester in order to best utilize resources or to ensure that  
497 the program is completed while student knowledge is still current. Alternatively, setting  
498 a maximum number of units may make sense for students on probation.

499 a. Approved course or semester withdrawals (W grades on the unofficial transcript)  
500 are considered to be without prejudice and should not be counted as an attempt  
501 at a course if the major program restricts the number of attempts for a course  
502 (per University Policy S09-7).

503 b. For graduate students, the university will use grade averaging in computing the  
504 SJSU GPA (per University Policy F08-2).

505 c. If the course in question is offered by another department, the program may  
506 consider only the first two attempts in determining probation or disqualification  
507 status. Clearly, the major department cannot restrict the number of times a  
508 student enrolls in a course offered by another department, but it is permitted, for  
509 instance, to ignore the grade from a third attempt to pass a class with a B or  
510 better.

511 A department may consider university probation or disqualification as a factor in  
512 determining probation or disqualification in the major.

513 **Exceptions.** Exceptions to the rule that administrative academic disqualification must  
514 be preceded by a probationary period may be made in the following cases:

515 a. In clinical courses, laboratory courses, student teaching assignments, or other  
516 types of programmatic requirements, there may be such serious concerns about  
517 the safety or well-being of the student, other students, clients, patients, and so  
518 forth, that repetition of the courses is not reasonable. For such courses or  
519 programmatic experiences, departments may establish “no repeat” policies, i.e.,  
520 a course may not be repeated if not passed on the first attempt. However, the  
521 “no repeat” option would not have to be in place to disqualify a student from a  
522 course. In clinical or lab settings in which safety or well-being are severely  
523 compromised, an instructor may disenroll a student from the course, which may  
524 lead to disqualification from the major. In general, the immediate move from  
525 good standing to disqualification (without a term of probation in between) should  
526 be associated with the inability to satisfy a specific course requirement on the  
527 first and only allowable attempt, not with a less specific programmatic  
528 requirement. Unless clearly falling into the category described here, courses by  
529 which immediate disqualification can be imposed must be approved in advance  
530 by the ADRRC.

531 b. A program can disqualify a student without a probationary period for behavior  
532 that fails to comply with professional standards of conduct appropriate to the field

533 of study. This conduct could occur in or out of class. It must be highly egregious  
534 for the disqualification action to be taken. Examples include threatening  
535 behavior, repeated disruptions of classes that interfere with the educational  
536 opportunities of other students, and repeated acts of professorial disrespect,  
537 badgering, rudeness, interruptions, and verbal or written abuse. The  
538 disqualification action is still appealable so it is advisable that the program  
539 consult with Graduate Studies before proceeding.

- 540 c. Conditional acceptance to a program is, in effect, acceptance under probation in  
541 the major. Typically, a specified set of courses or requirements must be passed  
542 prior to attaining good standing in the program. There may be time limits or unit  
543 limits established to satisfy the conditions, which, if not met, may lead to  
544 disqualification from the major degree program without an intervening term on  
545 explicit probation. Cohort programs must provide in their policies a reasonable  
546 accommodation for students who must stop out for legitimate reasons.
- 547 d. Teaching credential students do not receive a degree from SJSU and are subject  
548 to the regulations of the state legislature and licensing agency. Credential  
549 courses that exceed the seven-year limit cannot be revalidated. As with  
550 graduate master's degree programs in the CSU, the overall GPA and candidacy  
551 GPA must be at 3.0 or above for completion. In the case of credentials, a  
552 recommendation from the university to the state credentialing agency would be  
553 withheld without the requisite GPA. Students who fail to achieve this level of  
554 scholastic success or who are deemed dispositionally unsuitable for a teaching  
555 career can be precluded by the program from repeating courses or taking other  
556 courses to raise the GPA and so are effectively permanently terminated from the  
557 university without the credential recommendation.

#### 558 **4. Reinstatement after Administrative Academic Disqualification**

559 Without compelling reasons, administratively academically disqualified graduate  
560 students may not be reinstated to the major from which they were dismissed. Should a  
561 graduate student may find a new program willing to reinstate, transfer into that program  
562 will require program approval via a Graduate Change-of-Major application process  
563 without reapplication to the university, if permitted by the new department or school.  
564 However, should more than one semester pass without reinstatement, reapplication  
565 would be necessary. The student may not take courses in matriculated status before  
566 approval is secured. Disqualified students may not take graduate-level courses through  
567 Open University.

### 568 **III. Appeal of Administrative Academic Probation or Disqualification**

569 Upon receiving notice of administrative academic probation or disqualification, students should  
570 first consult with their advisors, then, if necessary, file a written appeal first with a program-  
571 level faculty committee, then with the appropriate ADRRC appeals officer, the Associate Dean  
572 of Undergraduate Studies or the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies. In either case, the  
573 appeal should be based on (a) advising or administrative errors, (b) actions by the department  
574 or school that were contrary to university policy, or (c) extenuating circumstances.

575 A critical first step in the appeal process is consultation by a student with an advisor  
576 representing the major in which reinstatement is sought. A report of the consultation and the  
577 advisor's recommendation should be forwarded to the ADRRC.

578 In cases of extenuation, a student must present evidence of extenuating circumstances  
579 beyond the his or her control that disrupted previously satisfactory academic performance, and  
580 documentation that such conditions will no longer affect academic performance.

581 Establishing and evaluating the procedure for the appeal process is the charge of the ADRRC.  
582 The following operating rules have been put into effect for appeals of probation and  
583 disqualification administrative academic probation and disqualification.

584 **A. Student Appeal Filing.** Students must submit a written appeal to the appropriate  
585 appeals officer of the ADRRC, the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies or of  
586 Graduate Studies, within one calendar month after the start of the succeeding Fall or  
587 Spring semester. The student name, ID, contact information (email and phone), unofficial  
588 transcript, and a personal statement must be included.

589 **B. Validity of Appeal.** The appeals officer is afforded the authority to determine whether  
590 adequate grounds exist for a formal hearing. He or she will conduct a review to determine  
591 whether the student has been treated according to the approved departmental/school  
592 policy (that is, whether policy has been faithfully executed by the department or school),  
593 whether the student was adequately and reasonably informed of the policy, whether an  
594 adequate and persuasive written record of actionable student conduct was constructed,  
595 and whether the student's conduct and/or course grade makes him or her subject to the  
596 consequences of the policy. If the case cannot be settled by consultation with  
597 department/school personnel and if the complaint is based on violation of an approved  
598 departmental policy that the ADRRC deems to be confusing, unclear, or unfair, then the  
599 ADRRC will form a subcommittee and schedule a hearing, normally within 45 working days  
600 of receiving the student appeal.

601 **C. Subcommittee Structure.** The subcommittee will be chaired by the Associate Dean of  
602 either Undergraduate Studies or Graduate Studies, based on the student career, and he or  
603 she will also be a voting member. The subcommittee will further consist of one college  
604 Associate Dean as a second voting member, chosen on a rotating basis. The Associate  
605 Dean of the college in which the student's program resides will also serve but as a  
606 nonvoting member. The third voting member, again on a rotating basis, will be an ADRRC  
607 member who is not an Associate Dean.

608 **D. Hearing Rules.** Documentation can be submitted by either party but must be disclosed  
609 to the other party. Testifying individuals may include the student complainant, the  
610 department chair/school director or a designee, and other individuals requested by either  
611 party if deemed relevant by the subcommittee chair. Nontestifying individuals present for  
612 emotional support or legal representation may not speak unless directly addressed.

613 **E. Decisions.** Unless additional testimony or significant investigation is needed following  
614 an appeal hearing, the ADRRC subcommittee will notify the student of its decision in writing  
615 within 10 working days. Of the three voting members of the subcommittee, a majority is  
616 needed for a decision.

617 Students have the right to consult with the University Ombudsperson at any point during this  
618 process.

619 Approved: April 18, 2016

620 Vote: 14-0-1

621 Present: Bruck (nonvoting), Brooks, Sen, Sofish, Campsey, Branz (nonvoting),  
622 Walters, Kaufman, Sullivan-Green, Abdukheir, Medina, Medrano, Khan,  
623 Wilson, Simpson, Nash, Amante.

624 Absent: Gay, Rees

625 Financial Impact: None

626 Workload Impact: None

627 Financial Impact: Not significant

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

10  
11  
12 Resolved: That the attached documents following be adopted as the text for revised  
13 Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTE) and Student Opinion of  
14 Laboratory Teaching Effectiveness (SOLATE) questionnaires; be it further

15  
16 Resolved: That this become effective for the administration of Fall 2016 SOTEs and  
17 SOLATEs.

18  
19 Rationale: F12-6, Evaluation in Effectiveness in Teaching for all Faculty, states:

20  
21 SERB shall prepare the specific questions and survey instrument to  
22 be used to measure student opinions of teaching effectiveness. It  
23 shall decide the scale, format, and layout of the instrument, and  
24 determine the information that is provided in the reports generated  
25 by the surveys. The instrument shall be approved by the Senate  
26 upon recommendation of SERB and the Professional Standards  
27 Committee, and may only be amended by SERB.

28  
29 SERB has worked diligently over the course of two years to amend the existing SOTE  
30 and SOLATE survey instrument. The last time the instruments were changed was in  
31 2004.

32  
33 A draft was prepared too late last year (AY 2014-15) to be reviewed by the Senate, and  
34 Professional Standards reviewed a draft on August 31 provided by SERB. Professional  
35 Standards provided advice which resulted in some additional changes over the course of  
36 the year and the receipt of this draft in April.

37  
38 SERB is a board specifically appointed for expertise on survey research and contains the  
39 AVP for IEA as an advisor. Professional Standards and the Senate may accept or reject  
40 the survey instruments provided by SERB, but may not amend the text of the survey  
41 instrument they have provided.

42  
43 One major change is the addition of the free-response section to the SOLATE instrument.  
44 Giving students the opportunity to go beyond the numerical ratings and write a free  
45 response is required by our policy but has inexplicably only been part of the SOTE  
46 instrument and not the SOLATE instrument. This will bring our laboratory evaluations into  
47 conformity with policy and allow students in lab courses the same opportunity to respond  
48 as students in other courses.

49  
50 SERB added an informational question about how many hours students devote to course-  
51 related activities. The Chair of SERB indicated that this was intended " to facilitate  
52 evaluation of course workload relative to Carnegie units (Question 18 on the SOTE;

53 Question 14 on the SOLATE)" and that it "was added after discussions with department  
54 chairs and curriculum committees tasked with the duty of evaluating course  
55 workload." Members of the Professional Standards Committee are of mixed opinions  
56 about this rationale for a question on hours of student work.  
57

58 Questions 14 and up on the SOTE and 10 and higher on the SOLATE are informational  
59 items and are not "normed" and compared between departments.  
60

61 Approved: April 18, 2016

62 Vote: 8-0-0

63 Present: Peter, Green, White, Lee, Virick, Kauppila, Sandoval-Rios,  
64 Hamedi-Hagh

65 Absent: Riley

66 Financial Impact: No changes over the previous policy.

67 Workload Impact: Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics (IEA) will need to update the  
68 online questionnaires.

69 Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTE) Revision (SERB, final, March 2016)

70

71 This instrument is designed to be a professional evaluation of your instructor's teaching  
72 performance. It is NOT designed to measure your reaction to the subject, the facilities  
73 (such as the physical conditions of the classroom), or your instructor's physical  
74 appearance. Your individual ratings will be anonymous and a summary of items 1-20 will  
75 be available to your instructor after grades are turned in. This summary may enhance  
76 your instructor's teaching. It will also be used in the evaluation of your instructor for  
77 personnel matters such as retention, tenure and promotion. **If the question does not  
78 apply to your course, please select "not applicable/no opportunity to observe".**

79 The instructor:

80 1. Demonstrated relevance of the course content:

81 5. Strongly Agree

82 4. Agree

83 3. Neutral

84 2. Disagree

85 1. Strongly Disagree

86 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

87

88 2. Used assignments that enhanced learning:

89 5. Strongly Agree

90 4. Agree

91 3. Neutral

92 2. Disagree

93 1. Strongly Disagree

94 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

95

96 3. Summarized/emphasized important points:

97 5. Strongly Agree

98 4. Agree

99 3. Neutral

100 2. Disagree

101 1. Strongly Disagree

102 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

103

104 4. Was responsive to questions and comments from students:

105 5. Strongly Agree

106 4. Agree

107 3. Neutral

108 2. Disagree

109 1. Strongly Disagree

110 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

111

112 5. Established an atmosphere that facilitated learning:

113 5. Strongly Agree

114 4. Agree

115 3. Neutral

116 2. Disagree

117 1. Strongly Disagree

- 118 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
119
- 120 6. Was approachable for assistance:  
121 5. Strongly Agree  
122 4. Agree  
123 3. Neutral  
124 2. Disagree  
125 1. Strongly Disagree  
126 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
127
- 128 7. Was respectful of the diversity of students in this class:  
129 5. Strongly Agree  
130 4. Agree  
131 3. Neutral  
132 2. Disagree  
133 1. Strongly Disagree  
134 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
135
- 136 8. Showed strong interest in teaching this class:  
137 5. Strongly Agree  
138 4. Agree  
139 3. Neutral  
140 2. Disagree  
141 1. Strongly Disagree  
142 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
143
- 144 9. Used teaching methods that helped students learn important concepts:  
145 5. Strongly Agree  
146 4. Agree  
147 3. Neutral  
148 2. Disagree  
149 1. Strongly Disagree  
150 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
151
- 152 10. Used grading criteria that were clear:  
153 5. Strongly Agree  
154 4. Agree  
155 3. Neutral  
156 2. Disagree  
157 1. Strongly Disagree  
158 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
159
- 160 11. Helped students analyze complex/abstract ideas:  
161 5. Strongly Agree  
162 4. Agree  
163 3. Neutral  
164 2. Disagree  
165 1. Strongly Disagree  
166 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
167

168 12. Provided meaningful feedback about student work:  
169 5. Strongly Agree  
170 4. Agree  
171 3. Neutral  
172 2. Disagree  
173 1. Strongly Disagree  
174 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
175

176 13. Overall, this instructor's teaching was effective:  
177 5. Strongly Agree  
178 4. Agree  
179 3. Neutral  
180 2. Disagree  
181 1. Strongly Disagree  
182 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
183

184 Please answer the following informational items:  
185

186 14. How would you describe your efforts in this course?  
187 Extraordinary  
188 High  
189 Average  
190 Low  
191 Minimal  
192

193  
194 15. How often did you attend class?  
195 Almost always  
196 Often  
197 Occasionally  
198 Seldom  
199 Almost never  
200

201 16. What is your current estimate of your expected overall grade in this course?  
202 A  
203 B  
204 C  
205 D or F  
206 Other (Credit/No Credit, Incomplete, etc.)  
207

208 17. You are a:  
209 Freshman  
210 Sophomore  
211 Junior  
212 Senior  
213 Graduate Student  
214 Credential Only  
215 Other (e.g. Open University)  
216

217 18. During a typical week in this course, how many hours did you spend outside of class

218 on course-related activities (such as reading, completing assignments, studying, service  
219 learning, field work, group work, etc.)?  
220

221 (NOTE: This will be programmed to be answered as a number field, and the course units  
222 will be added to the report, allowing users to easily divide the answer by the actual course  
223 units to generate Carnegie Units.  
224

225 19. Did any other student attempt to influence your answers on this survey?

226 Yes

227 No

228  
229 20. Did your instructor attempt to influence your answers on this survey?

230 Yes

231 No

232  
233 Free-Response Questions:

234  
235 What do you think are the strengths of this instructor's teaching?

236  
237 What suggestions, if any, do you have to further improve the instructor's teaching?

238 If you like, please use this space to elaborate on your responses to the multiple choice  
239 questions above.  
240

241 Student Opinion of Laboratory and Activity Teaching Effectiveness (SOLATE) Revision  
242 (SERB, final, March 2016)

243

244 This instrument is designed to be a professional evaluation of your instructor's teaching  
245 performance. It is NOT designed to measure your reaction to the subject, the facilities  
246 (such as the physical conditions of the classroom), or your instructor's physical  
247 appearance. Your individual ratings will be anonymous and a summary of items 1-15 will  
248 be available to your instructor after grades are turned in. This summary may enhance  
249 your instructor's teaching. It will also be used in the evaluation of your instructor for  
250 personnel matters such as retention, tenure and promotion. **If the question does not**  
251 **apply to your course, please select "not applicable/no opportunity to observe".**

252 The lab or activity instructor:

253

254 1: made course requirements clear.

255 5. Strongly Agree

256 4. Agree

257 3. Neutral

258 2. Disagree

259 1. Strongly Disagree

260 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

261

262 2: used grading criteria that were clear.

263 5. Strongly Agree

264 4. Agree

265 3. Neutral

266 2. Disagree

267 1. Strongly Disagree

268 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

269

270 3: was well prepared for class or activity.

271 5. Strongly Agree

272 4. Agree

273 3. Neutral

274 2. Disagree

275 1. Strongly Disagree

276 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

277

278 4: showed concern for student success in the course, and was accessible and responsive  
279 to students

280 5. Strongly Agree

281 4. Agree

282 3. Neutral

283 2. Disagree

284 1. Strongly Disagree

285 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

286

287 5: made the class environment safe for students, including demonstration of the proper  
288 use of any equipment and techniques.

289 5. Strongly Agree

290 4. Agree  
291 3. Neutral  
292 2. Disagree  
293 1. Strongly Disagree  
294 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
295  
296 6: helped me integrate the lecture concepts with the class/activity.  
297 5. Strongly Agree  
298 4. Agree  
299 3. Neutral  
300 2. Disagree  
301 1. Strongly Disagree  
302 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
303  
304 7: increased my understanding of the subject.  
305 5. Strongly Agree  
306 4. Agree  
307 3. Neutral  
308 2. Disagree  
309 1. Strongly Disagree  
310 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
311  
312 8: stimulated my interest in the subject.  
313 5. Strongly Agree  
314 4. Agree  
315 3. Neutral  
316 2. Disagree  
317 1. Strongly Disagree  
318 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
319  
320 9: Overall, this instructor's teaching was effective.  
321 5. Strongly Agree  
322 4. Agree  
323 3. Neutral  
324 2. Disagree  
325 1. Strongly Disagree  
326 Not applicable/no opportunity to observe  
327  
328 Please answer the following informational items:  
329  
330 10. How often did you attend class?  
331 Almost always  
332 Often  
333 Occasionally  
334 Seldom  
335 Almost never  
336  
337 11. What is your current estimate of your expected overall grade in this course?  
338 A  
339 B

340 C  
341 D or F  
342 Other (Credit/No Credit, Incomplete, etc.)

343  
344 12. You are a:  
345 Freshman  
346 Sophomore  
347 Junior  
348 Senior  
349 Graduate Student  
350 Credential Only  
351 Other (e.g. Open University)

352  
353 13: During a typical week in this course, how many hours did you spend outside of class  
354 on course-related activities (such as reading, completing assignments, studying, service  
355 learning, field work, group work, etc.)?

356  
357 (NOTE: This will be programmed to be answered as a number field, and the course units  
358 will be added to the report, allowing users to easily divide the answer by the actual course  
359 units to generate Carnegie Units.

360  
361  
362  
363 14. Did any other student attempt to influence your answers on this survey?  
364 Yes  
365 No

366  
367 15. Did your instructor attempt to influence your answers on this survey?  
368 Yes  
369 No

370  
371 Free-Response Questions:

372  
373 What do you think are the strengths of this instructor's teaching?

374  
375 What suggestions, if any, do you have to further improve the instructor's teaching?

376 If you like, please use this space to elaborate on your responses to the multiple choice  
377 questions above.

378