

**SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE**

**2019/2020**

**Agenda**

**October 7, 2019, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm  
Engineering 285/287**

- I. **Call to Order and Roll Call:**
- II. **Approval of Minutes:**  
***Senate Minutes of September 16, 2019***
- 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 –  
***EC Minutes of September 9, 2019***
  - B. Consent Calendar –
  - C. Executive Committee Action Items –
- V. **Unfinished Business:**  
  
***AS 1743, Policy Recommendation, Amendment B to S16-8;  
Selection and Review of Administrators (Final Reading)***
- VI. **Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation)**
  - A. Professional Standards Committee (PS):  
***AS 1726, Amendment C to University Policy F12-6,  
Evaluation of Effectiveness in Teaching for All Faculty  
(Final Reading)***
  - B. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):  
***AS 1747, Senate Management Resolution, Amendment A to  
SM-F09-2, Change to the Composition of the Academic  
Disqualification and Reinstatement Review Committee  
(Final Reading)***  
  
***AS 1748, Policy Recommendation, Adding General Unit  
Seats to the Student Evaluation Review Board, Student  
Fairness Committee, University Library Board, and  
University Writing Committee [Amendment B to University  
Policy F10-2, Amendment B to University Policy S14-3,***

***Amendment B to S15-10, Amendment A to University Policy S19-3] (Final Reading)***

***AS 1749, Policy Recommendation, Amendment B to S13-9, Merging, Dividing, Transferring, Eliminating Academic Units (Final Reading)***

***AS 1735, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy F15-13, Updating the Board of General Studies Membership, Charge, and Responsibilities (First Reading)***

C. University Library Board (ULB):

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

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

**VII. Special Committee Reports:**

**VIII. New Business:**

***Time Certain: 3:00 p.m., Comprehensive Campaign  
Presentation by Interim VP of University Advancement, Peter Smits***

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

A. Chief Diversity Officer

B. CSU Faculty Trustee (by standing invitation)

C. Statewide Academic Senators

D. Provost

E. Associated Students President

F. Vice President for Administration and Finance

G. Vice President for Student Affairs

**X. Adjournment**

**2019/2020 Academic Senate**

**MINUTES  
September 16, 2019**

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

**Ex Officio:**

Present: Rodan, Van Selst, Curry,  
Frazier, Mathur, Parent  
Absent: None

**CHHS Representatives:**

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

**Administrative Representatives:**

Present: Papazian, Day, Faas,  
Wong(Lau), Del Casino  
Absent: None

**COB Representatives:**

Present: He  
Absent: Khavul

**Deans:**

Present: Lattimer, d'Alarcao, Stacks  
Absent: Ehrman

**EDUC Representatives:**

Present: Marachi

**Students:**

Present: Kaur, Delgadillo, Gallo,  
Trang, Birrer, Roque  
Absent: None

**ENGR Representatives:**

Present: Sullivan-Green, Kumar, Okamoto,  
Ramasubramanian  
Absent: None

**H&A Representatives:**

Present: Khan, Riley, McKee, Kitajima, Coelho

**Alumni Representative:**

Present: Walters

**SCI Representatives:**

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

**Emeritus Representative:**

Present: McClory

**SOS Representatives:**

Present: Peter, Wilson, Jackson, Hart  
Absent: None

**Honorary Representative:**

Present: Lessow-Hurley

**General Unit Representatives:**

Present: Higgins, Masegian, Monday  
Absent: None

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

The minutes of May 13, 2019 (last meeting of 2018-2019) were approved as amended by President Papazian (48-0-2). The minutes of May 13, 2019 ( first meeting of 2019-2020) were approved as written (46-0-4).

**III. Communications and Questions –**

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

Chair Mathur welcomed new Senators for AY 2019-2020. Senators were reminded that they represent the needs of their college as well as the university.

Chair Mathur announced the holiday party at the President's house on December 12, 2019 at 6:30 p.m.

Chair Mathur announced that the Senate Retreat will be held on January 31, 2019 from 8:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. in MLK 225/229.

The Senate will be sending out calls for nominations for three special elections in the colleges of Social Sciences, Education, and the General Unit in the next week.

The Senate Administrator and Associate Vice Chair have been working diligently to staff the committees and are close to filling all vacant seats. The Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility is mostly staffed except for the Colleges of Health and Human Sciences and Humanities and the Arts.

The Senate now has a twitter account @SJSUSenate.

The Senate Office is working on keywords for policy searches, website changes, and converting older Senate Meeting minutes from tape to digital records.

**B. From the President of the University –**

The President welcomed all new Senators and students as well as Trustee Sabalius.

The Trustee's Budget was mostly supported by the Governor and legislature and the University is in a good place this year.

There are several bills that will affect the CSU pending in the legislature. The most significant bills include AB 829, that the Governor signed, that granted the doctorate in Occupational Therapy to the CSU. Our colleagues in Health and Human Sciences are already hard at work on the curriculum.

SB 206 will allow student athletes to monetize their name, likeness, and image. This bill is likely to be signed by the governor and will have unintended consequences as linked to NCAA rules and regulations. AB 48 is the Capital Budget vote bill that would allow bonds for capital projects to be put on the ballot such as for deferred maintenance.

SB 24, medical abortion bill, would require campuses and health centers to provide abortion support. There have been some amendments that would allow a third party to provide the services. The Governor is expected to sign this.

Then there is AB 1460, that requires a 3-unit course in Ethnic Studies for every student as part of the general education. The president reviewed the progress of this bill over the summer and noted some of the opposition to this bill. This has been extended to a two-year bill.

Census is coming up and the President is working to ensure everyone is counted. There are real consequences when the census is undercounted. There will be well paying jobs for students. You will be hearing a lot more about this.

The President gave updates on several searches including the Vice President of University Advancement (VPUA), Dean of the College of Health and Human Sciences, and the Dean of the College of Graduate Studies. It is especially important to get a new VPUA on board with the launch of the Capital Campaign.

The Provost and Senate Chair have been working on staffing the Strategic Planning Steering Committee.

**Questions:**

Q: The President was asked if there would be fewer unsigned policies in the future, given the number of unsigned policies still pending?

A: The President responded that once she signed these policies they are university policies and she needs to be sure they are right for the university. The President cannot always review a policy in two weeks and wants to ensure that the policies can be implemented.

Q: Can you update us on the steps being taken to address the athletics and Title IX issues brought up in the news articles over the summer?

A: Some of the issues were addressed right away such as correcting mis-statements in the article and adding support and training. Then we had a consultant team come here and look at athletics and procedures and they are making recommendations. Other issues are still being addressed under Title IX.

Q: Can you update us on what is happening with regard to creating a task force to study the issue of bullying on this campus?

A: The CDO will comment on this in her announcements later in the meeting as she is working on this with the Provost Office.

**IV. Executive Committee Report –**

**A. Executive Committee Minutes –**

**Executive Committee Minutes of June 5, 2019**

**Executive Committee Minutes of July 18, 2019**

**Executive Committee Minutes of August 8, 2019**

**Executive Committee Minutes of August 26, 2019**

**Questions:**

Q: Regarding the minutes of June 5, 2019 and August 8, 2019 about the Event Center being named Provident Credit Union Event Center, it says a public announcement will be sent, but I've never seen one. Was this sent out?

A: An announcement was sent out last week by VP Faas' office. Essentially, it said that the Event Center had been renamed the Provident Credit Union Event Center. Provident will pay us \$300,000 plus a 3% yearly increase for ten years. These funds will be used for Event Center upkeep.

**B. Consent Calendar –**

Associate Vice Chair (AVC) Marachi presented an amendment to remove Katy Kao from the Graduate Studies and Research Committee and replace her with Gokay Saldamli, also from Engineering, due to a conflict with the committee meeting times.

A question was asked about why the student, Flor Sario, was not removed from the Campus Planning Board (CPB) on the consent calendar as she has a conflict with classes and can't make the meetings. The CPB Chair notified the AVC, Senate Office, and Chair of the Senate on multiple occasions. AVC Marachi explained that the seat Ms. Sario occupies is a designated seat for that particular AS Board Director and that the Executive Committee had discussed and decided to remove her from the consent calendar until the AS President makes a determination as to how AS wants to handle the situation. The seat is designated specifically for Ms. Sario's position and does not currently allow for a "designee" to fill the seat. The AS President is discussing this issue with the AS Board of Directors and will provide feedback to the AVC regarding this designated student senator seat.

There was no dissent to the consent calendar as amended by AVC Marachi.

**C. Executive Committee Action Items:**

The Executive Committee approved *SS-F19-1, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Opposing AB 1460*, on July 10, 2019 on behalf of the Academic Senate while the Senate was out on summer recess. The Senate voted unanimously to endorse SS-F19-1 (50-0-0).

**V. Unfinished Business - None**

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

**A. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) – No report.**

**B. Professional Standards Committee (PS) – No report.**

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

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1743, Policy Recommendation, Amendment B to S16-8, Selection and Review of Administrators (Final Reading)*.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change lines 30 and 46 to read "Senior Director of Faculty Affairs." Senator Stacks presented an amendment to add the AVP of Research. The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Stacks amendment passed with no Nays or Abstentions (50-0-0).

The President commented that the voice of the Vice President of Research and Innovation (VPRI) was absent on appointing someone who works within his office and this is the type of thing that would hold up approval of a policy like this. The Provost commented that we might want to table the resolution until after we consult with the VPRI. **Senator Frazier presented a motion to postpone the resolution until the next Senate meeting. The motion was seconded. The**

**Senate voted and the motion passed with 1 Nay and 3 Abstentions (46-1-3).**

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1742, Amendment A to University Policy S10-5, Charge and Membership of the Sustainability Board (Final Reading)*. Senator Parent presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change the name of the “AS Director of Sustainability Affairs” to “AS Director of Sustainability.”  
**The Senate voted and AS 1742 passed as amended (48-2-0).**

Senator Shifflett pulled *AS 1747, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to SM-F09-2, Change to the Composition of the Academic Disqualification and Reinstatement Review Committee (First Reading)* from discussion at the senate due to some feedback received.

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1748, Policy Recommendation, Adding General Unit Seats to the Student Evaluation Review Board (SERB), Student Fairness Committee (SFC), University Library Board (ULB), University Writing Committee (UWC) (First Reading)*.

Questions:

Q: Under the new policy, section 3.b.1, allows for faculty from all colleges so the UWC has already got spots for the general unit.

A: Here is the problem, that section is talking about representative units. The College of Professional and Global Education (CPGE) faculty are members of the general unit. If we put a seat for the CPGE then we would be giving a seat to a department since the CPGE only has one department right now. Until that college is something more than the general unit, the policy needs a seat for the general unit.

Q: Then I would suggest changing the wording so that it doesn't say faculty from all colleges, since CPGE is a college.

A: O&G will take this under advisement.

Q: In the past, the general unit included faculty who were not teaching faculty and the reason the general unit was excluded from SERB was that it was felt the members of Student Evaluation Review Board (SERB) should be teaching faculty who were subjected to SOTES. In the case of the Student Fairness Committee (SFC), it was felt that only faculty who were teachers of record and had experience assigning grades should be members. Now it is more complicated. There are both teaching and non-teaching faculty in the general unit as well as staff. Would O&G consider limiting the members of the general unit who can serve on SERB and the SFC to only teaching faculty?

A: Yes. O&G will take this up. There was discussion in O&G that staff advisers in the general unit had insight and maybe we should keep the general unit open for them. We will continue that discussion.

Q: If the charge of SERB is expanded to include SOTES for advisers, then it would be appropriate for them to be included.

Q: Regarding the SFC, since you are adding an additional faculty member will that change the student-faculty ratio and should you be adding another student?

A: Each time we add a faculty member to a committee, we do not automatically add a student. If you want to suggest the need for that please do and I'll bring that into the discussion.

Q: Could you look into the SFC, because I believe that a percentage of the committee may need to be students and that if you add a faculty member it could change that percentage. Could O&G look at particular policies and make sure students are represented according to those proportions if any?

A: Yes.

---

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1749, Amendment B to University Policy S13-9, Merging, Dividing, Transferring, Eliminating Academic Units (First Reading)*.

Questions:

Q: In line 68-72, would O&G consider implications for non-tenure-track faculty and also implications for course offerings?

A: Yes.

Q: In 7, and probably 5 as well, I think it might be useful to mention seniority. Would O&G consider this?

A: Yes, we've got that.

Q: Would the committee consider the term "meaningful consultation"?

A: The approach the committee took was to make sure things were put in writing so there was time to consider things. We felt putting it in writing and ensuring there was a timeline would ensure "meaningful consultation."

Q: When this comes back could we have something a little more specific about the reason for the changes?

A: When you don't have something in writing, one person hears one thing and another person hears something else, so this is why.

Q: Line 57 refers to Academic Semester, so is that meant to exclude Summer and Winter Session?

A: Yes.

Q: Then could we be more specific about it.

A: O&G will revisit this.

Q: Could O&G specify what a reasonable amount of time is?

A: What we have here is that voting should not commence until after 10 duty days of review, and voting faculty should have no less than 5 days or more than 15 days to vote.

---



Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1751, Policy Recommendation, Amendment to the Senate Constitution Regarding Administrator Representatives (First Reading)*.

Questions:

Q: What is the thinking in O&G about placing the AVP of Research on the Senate instead of the VPRI?

A: O&G discussed this at length. O&G feels the level of engagement the Senate needs is the AVP of Research. That person can best inform the Senate on policy.

Q: Did you also consider the need to balance different levels of management such as a certain number of VPs and a certain number of Deans?

A: We tried to hint at that in the rationale at the end when we said that the Senate needs, from the leadership side, people with responsibility for visionary planning to concrete implementation responsibilities across and within divisions. When it comes to the new VPRI, O&G felt that the Senate needs the AVP of Research. It was a very thoughtful discussion. O&G also thought that if we add another VP then we need to add two additional faculty members to the Senate.

Q: In terms of the past on the Senate, we had some rotation possibility with the AVPs and/or Deans being able to occupy those seats. Originally we had four representatives. We had two Deans and two rotators. O&G and the Senate need to consider the consequence of removing that rotation possibility.

A: Thank you.

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

Senator White presented *AS 1751, Policy Recommendation, Combined Bachelor's and Master's Program (Final Reading)*.

Senator White presented a page of amendments from the Curriculum and Research Committee that were friendly to the body. **The Senate voted and AS 1751 passed as amended with 0 Nays and 0 Abstentions (50-0-0).**

#### **E. University Library Board (ULB) –**

Senator Frazier encouraged Senators to attend a presentation on Elsevier at the MLK Library on September 26, 2019 at noon in MLK 225. The library is looking at what we might do if they lose the subscription to Elsevier and would like input. Please RSVP. Senator Frazier will re-send the link for registration. Lunch will be provided.

### **VII. State of the University Announcements. Questions. In rotation.**

#### **A. Vice President for Student Affairs –**

We are two days away from census. Our total enrollment at this point is 35,803 students. About two weeks ago, we were at 36,084. However, that is expected. That is a robust enrollment for us. We are not experiencing enrollment declines yet. However, we need to be concerned about internal trends in the state of California and about our own marketability. One of the things we are seeing is a dropping off in enrollment of our first-year students. This is a national trend. We are hearing this from lots of institutions. Other universities are also going deeper into their waiting

lists. We are at 37,073 in terms of of our enrollment. Last year we ended up at 36,087. Our international students are down by about 200 students from 30,092, which is not quite 10%. Our graduate student numbers are just about where they were previously.

Student Affairs is also working on a Strategic Enrollment Plan. SJSU does not have a Strategic Enrollment Plan right now. This will take us a good year. We will be looking at an Academic Plan component, how we want to shape the classes, our graduate enrollment, marketing and brand awareness, and the undergraduate student experience. This will strategically make us ready for what is coming.

**Questions:**

Q: I have question about the NACADA Report on Advising. Some of the items in the summary are somewhat concerning. Particularly, any recommendations to consider exclusively professional adviser models, when advising is one of the expectations for faculty for retention-tenure-promotion, is of concern. Will this be considered?

A: This is an external review. We have never taken every suggestion and implemented it from an external review. What an external review does is give us a reflection back to understand what may be happening in the marketplace, what makes sense, and works best for us. What we have right now is a situation where students are going to different places on campus for advising and getting different answers. There are lots of things in the report we are not going to do. Whatever we do will not be a surprise and will make sense for our campus.

Q: What steps have been taken to address the drop in international students?

A: Our international recruitment is mainly coming out of the College of Professional and Global Studies and we are doing pretty well. We need to look at what our goals are around enrollment before we can effect a plan.

Q: Would it be possible to have international students online and not physically present at the university?

A: I'm happy to bring that back to the next conversation. It may take a little work to look into and I'd like the Dean to be with us for that conversation. VP Day is happy to talk about this offline as well.

Q: In considering recruitment practices for international students, we need to consider employment, particularly with Graduate STEM focus that is in place today. This needs to be a part of any international student recruitment plan.

A: Agreed.

**B. Chief Diversity Officer (CDO) –**

Over the summer the CDO's office did face-to-face training with 8,700 new students including frosh and transfers. These students were given an hour of intergroup engagement and facilitation skills including Title IX. This is the third summer the CDO's Office has given this training to incoming students. CDO Wong(Lau) was

also invited to facilitate a day and a half long retreat for all the directors and their staff for the Institute for Teaching and Learning by the Chancellor's Office in Long Beach. In addition, the CDO's staff did several hours of training with new tenure-track faculty and the Jumpstart program.

For Fall 2019, the CDO and staff will be focusing on the Campus Climate Survey. Rankin and Associates will be handling the survey and results and have come to the campus to meet with the President and her cabinet to discuss how they will be conducting the survey and handling the results. Rankin and Associates are very experienced and they are all academics themselves. When everything is completed, they will return to the campus (in a year) and give a full report of the results of the survey to the President and the campus at the same time. There are 30 members of the working committee. They are mostly faculty, staff, and students. We were asked not to include Management Personnel Plan (MPP) members. Rankin and Associates are running 24 focus groups on one day in October. At this point, they are populating those focus groups to be sure they are representatives of all groups. The campus needs a 30% completion rate in order to report our findings. We are going through the Institutional Review Board (IRB) process to be sure the data is protected. The target date for the survey to go live is March 2020 for 30 days. The working committee will come up with the questions as a result of the focus groups. There is a website setup if you have any questions.

An anti-bullying committee is being setup and CDO Wong(Lau) and Vice Chair McKee will be Co-Chairs of that committee. They have been working on the charge for that group. They have one additional seat to fill on the committee and then an announcement will be made and letters of appointment will be sent to the campus.

We are in the "Red Zone" for Title IX. This is what most campuses refer to as the first six weeks of school. This is when the highest number of sexual assaults, sexual misconduct, and harassment and other issues occur, particularly between first time students. We've also had our second hearing on campus in terms of the new Title IX process. We'll probably have another one in October.

The CDO will be having some campus conversations about the hate fliers that were put up on campus. These are yet to be scheduled.

The CDO continues to do 2-hour diversity trainings for faculty search committees on campus. The CDO is running these trainings with the Senior Director of Faculty Affairs, James Lee. This is the first time training will be required of all committee members and not just the chair. The CDO Office has completed 8 trainings. There will be an opportunity to Zoom in for one of these trainings.

Questions:

Q: Can you elaborate a little bit on the anti-bullying committee and how the members are being selected?

A: They are being selected for their expertise as well as the range of knowledge they bring and representation of different parts and groups on campus, e.g. lecturers, etc. The committee is projecting that the committee will have until December 2020.

Q: Is the committee going to be called something other than the Anti-Bullying Committee?

A: Yes, it will be called the Committee on Professional, Productive, and Ethical Expectations in Work Relations. This is language that came from some key documents from the Chancellor's Office.

**C. CSU Faculty Trustee (by standing invitation) –**

On August 9, 2019, Governor Newsom appointed Faculty Trustee Sabalius to another two-year term. The Senate gave Trustee Sabalius applause. Trustee Sabalius thanked the Senate and SJSU for their ongoing support and pledged to work diligently on behalf of SJSU and the CSU.

The appointment is twelve months and there is work over the summer. There is usually a July meeting of the Board of Trustees. Trustee Sabalius sent the report out. In addition, there was an August meeting of the education committee to discuss the fourth year of quantitative reasoning as a requirement for admission to the CSU.

Trustee Sabalius is also a guest of the ASCSU Executive Committee. In addition, there was also an Academic Senate Leadership Retreat.

Trustee Sabalius was in Georgia and visited our Dean from San Diego State where they conduct an Engineering program.

The legislators were in session over the summer and finalizing legislation so it was busy.

The next Board of Trustee meeting is next week. The big items that received a lot of media attention were the discussion on quantitative reasoning, admission requirements to the CSU, and a state auditor report that faulted the CSU for having \$1.5 billion in reserves. That report got a lot of media attention when it was released. It is neither the case that the money was hidden or that it is extra money. Much of it was designated reserves. The worst we are being accused of is saving too much money. The rainy day fund is only \$400 million and that would only get the CSU through about three weeks. The reserve funds held at the Chancellor's Office are only 1% to 2% of our yearly operating budget.

Regarding the ethnic studies requirement, the ASCSU will act even though AB 1460 has been postponed.

The CFA contract expires in June and bargaining is coming up. The Faculty Trustee is prohibited from being a part of any salary negotiations by the California Education Code, so Trustee Sabalius will not be participating.

This week on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, the ASCSU will meet and Trustee Sabalius will be there as well.

On Sunday, Trustee Sabalius will address the CSSA Board of Directors in San Marcos. The following week there is a Board of Trustees meeting on Tuesday and Wednesday. On Thursday, Trustee Sabalius will visit the Northridge campus. The following day on Friday, the CSU World Language Council will meet at Northridge and Trustee Sabalius will be attending that meeting as well.

In addition to all of this, in two weeks we begin planning for our 2020-2021 budget. This year's budget is a historic increase for the CSU. We did not get everything we wanted in ongoing funds, however, we received more than we asked for in one-time funds. We are very, very happy. It is a better budget than we have seen in a long, long, time.

Senator Peter made a motion to move the Provost next in rotation before the CSU Statewide Senators. The motion was seconded and approved.

**D. Provost—**

The Provost has visited a number of the colleges and chair meetings.

Last fall the we did a COACHE survey. The results are in and we are working on a communication plan right now. What is really exciting is that 51% of those asked to respond responded. People feel very strong about chairs and deans on the campus. People indicated they really want more emphasis on research and more transparency from senior leadership. There are some really interesting results. Some of the results were surprising and some were not. More to come on that.

We have two dean searches underway. One search is for the Dean of Graduate Studies, and is an internal search. We felt there was enough talent on the campus that we did not have to go with a national search. Then there is the search for a new Dean of the College of Health and Human Sciences. This search will launch soon and is on a national level.

We have authorized 70 faculty searches. The state has told the CSU that we need to spend \$35 million on increasing tenure density. That isn't \$35 million new dollars to spend, they want us to spend \$35 million out of what we have been given to increase the number of tenure and tenure-track faculty.

There has been a lot of organizational change. We want to align titles. People reporting to the Provost Office should have Vice Provost titles. We are also going to do a search for a Vice Provost of Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Analytics. This VP's charge will be to guide us through the asking and analyzing of data on the campus. The university is woefully short in this area. The structure of the Provost Office would become the Vice Provost of Undergraduate Studies, the Senior Vice

Provost of Academic Affairs, and the Vice Provost of Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Analytics.

**Questions:**

Q: The accreditation report makes specific reference to quantitative reasoning. The data from the August 29<sup>th</sup> meeting made crystal clear that the additional work has had a positive impact on graduation rates. Before the students get here, can your office look into the impact of additional quantitative reasoning work on our graduation rates?

A. Yes. Great idea.

Q: What kind of background do you expect for a Vice Provost of Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Analytics?

A: It could be a faculty member, or research and assessment folks.

Senator Marachi moved to extend the meeting by ten minutes. The Senate voted and the motion passed (49-1-0).

**E. CSU Statewide Academic Senators –**

A meeting has not been held yet but some items have already been discussed, such as AB 1460, 4<sup>th</sup> year quantitative requirements, and the GE Special Report. There is an outstanding report due from us in November. Expect to hear more next month.

The three things on our plate coming up next week include Ethnic Studies and there will be action before December. This campus has had a strong tradition of responding early and well. The 4<sup>th</sup> year quantitative reasoning has gotten a lot of discussion statewide. The evidence shows that if you have this fourth year, it is very beneficial, but of course the people most likely to have it are the people most favored by their background to begin with, so there is a lot of tension there. The final thing is that there is some tension around this push for “systemness.”

There are two technology-related committees at the CSU statewide level. We already had some issues with systems being taken offline during finals.

**F. Associated Students President –**

The AS Child Development Center has received the highest ranking in the Quality Rating Improvement System (QRIS) and has been reaccredited for next year. They have also received an award for an inclusive room for children with disabilities.

AS has a new Interim Director of Transportation Solutions, Tiffany Rodriguez.

AS is working on a land acknowledgement to honor the Muwekma Ohlone tribe as the original stewards of the land SJSU sits on.

Homecoming royalty is still taking applications.

AS President Parent will be joining Trustee Sabalius in San Marcos for the CSSA meeting.

**G. Vice President for Administration and Finance –**

VP Faas announced that the Faculty and Staff Lounge has been completed and the vending machines will be installed soon.

The new Science and Innovation Building is on track and on budget.

At a recent meeting at the Chancellor's Office, they commented that the CSU needs more of the type of deals we secured with the Provident Credit Union to bring in funds for the CSU.

**VIII. Special Committee Reports –**

**IX. New Business –**

The Academic Senate of 2019-2020 had its picture taken by the University Photographer, Bob Bain.

**X. Adjournment –** The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

**Executive Committee Minutes**  
**September 9, 2019**  
**ADM 167, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.**

Present: Mathur, Shifflett, Curry, Parent, Sullivan-Green, McKee, Del Casino, Frazier,  
Marachi, Peter, Wong(Lau), Day, White  
Absent: Papazian, Faas  
Guest: Smits

1. The Executive Committee approved the minutes of August 26, 2019 as amended by Senators Shifflett and Peter (13-0-0).
2. Update sent from Dean Elliott: Our advocacy through the passage of [SS-S19-1](#) *In Support of Increased Funding for the California State University System Electronic Core Collection* has resulted in an additional \$1 million in base funding for the CSU-wide electronic core collection of database and eResources.
3. The Consent Calendar was amended to remove “Flor Sario” from removals from the Campus Planning Board (CPB). The committee discussed the fact that Ms. Sario occupies a designated seat and cannot be removed or have a designee appointed without amending the structure of the CPB. AS will make a referral to change the seat structure to the Organization and Government Committee after they have discussion amongst their board and constituents. The motion to remove Ms. Sario from the consent calendar was seconded and approved until AS completes their discussion. There was no further dissent to the consent calendar.
4. The committee reviewed and approved uncontested faculty nominees for the University Library Board, Institutional Review Board, and Student Success Committee. The committee also approved one uncontested faculty and one uncontested staff nominee for the Budget Advisory Committee (13-0-0).
5. The committee reviewed and selected two staff nominees for the Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC) from a pool of twelve very strong candidates.
6. The committee reviewed and selected one staff nominee for the Student Fairness Committee (SFC) from a pool of six very qualified candidates.
7. The president is unable to attend today’s meeting as she is part of a presidential investiture ceremony at another university.
8. Interim Vice President of University Advancement (VPUA) Peter Smits gave the committee an update on the Comprehensive Campaign. On July 1, 2019, the campus kicked off a 7-8 year comprehensive fundraising campaign. The aspirational goal is \$350 million. It was noted that everyone on the campus



should be active participants in the campaign and faculty are crucial for their connections and engagement in the campaign. Previously, we had retained an outside consulting firm to determine priorities and themes. However, prior to building the campaign there should have been a discussion at the campus for what we would like to raise this money; what are the campus priorities for funding?

Consequently, the VPUA has asked the Deans to come up with three transformational ideas for changes needed. In October they will meet at a retreat with VP Smits to refine and vote on those ideas. At the end of the retreat they hope to have 8 to 12 big ideas that will become university-wide goals of the comprehensive campaign such as full-ride scholarships, a residential honors college (which the President and Provost support), etc. So, by mid-to-late November, we will have concrete ideas for what we should be raising money. Then, VPUA Smits will conduct a feasibility study in which 50 people from the community will be asked what they think of those ideas (e.g., civic leaders, industry partners). In late January 2020, VP Smits hopes to have the priorities lined up and finalized. The Provost has talked with the Deans to ensure that their transformational ideas are aligned with the strategic plan (i.e., the strategic plan is the filter for these ideas). VPUA Smits will then have discussions with donors on what our visions are. He also provided information about alignments of the campaign with Tower foundation goals and priorities.

Questions:

Q. Some funding priorities are linked to infrastructure. How will those projects be funded within the campaign?

A. Donors decide what they want to give to. However, if philanthropy can fund other ideas, this will free up monies to spend on other campus priorities.

Q: Will donors be vetted?

A: Yes, we have clear giving guidelines and committee vetting process that we adhere to.

Q: Are some donations prohibited due to Proposition 209?

A: The VPUA reviews all donations to ensure they meet all policies and guidelines.

9. From the CSU Statewide Senate:

An update on AB 1460 was given. There was a lot of discussion about all of the resolutions supporting ethnic studies, but not AB 1460. Some of the chatter email included legislative funding for a fourth-year quantitative reasoning requirement, and the impact on rural /low-income students who may not be able to pass fourth year requirement due to limited course/instructor availability. One problem is that some groups are conflating low-income students with URM students. Discussion has also included how to push appropriations to provide sufficient funding for this initiative. There should not be detrimental effects for students coming in for admissions to the CSU. We need to examine what we are doing at this campus and the different ways to come at these curricular initiatives.

We should be showcasing what we have done and opportunities we have created for our students.

10. From the Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA):

Our enrollment is at 36,084 students. Our first-year student enrollment is down a little bit, but our transfer student enrollment is up by 500 students. Our International Student enrollment is down about 100 students. We are at .2% of our enrollment target, which is an incredibly wonderful place to be.

11. From the Associated Students President:

The A.S. Operating Agreement has not yet been signed. They have been waiting for the president's signature for 9 months. The VPSA noted that the agreement will be reviewed by himself and the VPAF soon to provide guidance for the president.

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

These minutes were taken by the Senate Administrator on September 9, 2019. The minutes were transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on September 13, 2019. The minutes were reviewed by Chair Mathur on September 20, 2019. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on September 23, 2019.

<b>Consent Calendar for SJSU Academic Senate Meeting October 7th, 2019</b>				
<b>ADD:</b>	<b>Committee</b>	<b>Last Name/First Name</b>	<b>Term</b>	<b>Seat/College</b>
	Accreditation Review	Ramírez, Ruby	2022	Seat O (Faculty At Large)
	Athletics Board	Chang, Seung Ho	2022	Seat K (Faculty At Large)
	Athletics Board	Festejo, Katrina	EXO	Seat H (Student Athlete Advisory Committee President or designee)
	Budget Advisory Committee	Monsour, Sami	EXO	Seat C (AVP Academic Budgets/Planning)
	Graduate Studies and Research	Dudley, Nancy	2020	Seat G (Education) FAL
	Graduate Studies and Research	Honda, Jeff	EXO	Seat B (Associate Dean, Research)
	International Programs and Students	Brosio, Sarah	2020	Seat 1 (Student)
	International Programs and Students	Foust, Tricia	EXO	Seat D (Graduate Studies Office)
	International Programs and Students	Rogers, Bernadette	EXO	Seat C (AVP Enrollment Services/Designee)
	Program Planning	Agee, Ann	2022	Seat U (General Unit)
	Student Fairness Committee	Wang, Chunlei	2020	Seat F (Education) FAL
	Student Fairness Committee	Najib, Adam	2020	Seat 1 (Student)
	Student Fairness Committee	Ereno, Ryan	2020	Seat 2 (Student)
	Transit, Traffic, and Parking Committee	Rodriguez, Tiffany	2020	Seat C (Staff Member of Transit Demand Program)
	University Writing Committee	Hager, Michelle	EXO	Seat D (Writing Center Director)
	University Writing Committee	Honda, Jeff	EXO	Seat H (Dean, College of Graduate Studies)
	University Writing Committee	Russo, Amy	EXO	Seat E (Coordinator of Multi-Lingual Support Services)

<b>REMOVE:</b>	<b>Committee</b>	<b>Last Name/First Name</b>	<b>Term</b>	<b>Seat/College</b>
	Athletics Board	Quenga, Kameo	EXO	Seat H (Student Athlete Advisory Committee President or designee)
	Graduate Studies and Research	Friendly, Rayna	2020	Seat G (Education) FAL
	Instruction and Student Affairs	Hurtado, Matheo	2020	Seat P (General Unit) Senator
	International Programs and Students	Foust, Tricia	EXO	Seat C (AVP Enrollment/Acad Services or Designee)
	Program Planning	Agee, Ann	2020	Seat Q (Science) FAL
	Student Fairness Committee	Siebert, Erin	2020	Seat F (Education) FAL

6  
7  
8 **POLICY**  
9 **RECOMMENDATION**  
10 **Amendment C to University Policy F12-6**  
11 **Evaluation of Effectiveness in Teaching for All Faculty**  
12

13 Resolved: That F12-6 be amended as shown in the strikeout and underline excerpts  
14 of policy.  
15

16 Rationale: F12-6 is a lengthy and complex policy organizing all aspects of the  
17 evaluation of teaching by faculty. One portion of the policy concerns the administration  
18 of SOTEs (surveys of student opinion of teaching effectiveness) and within that  
19 segment there is a provision that allows faculty to exclude one course per year from  
20 their evaluations.  
21

22 The CBA mandates that SOTES will figure prominently in the evaluation of faculty.  
23 When policy moved SJSU from selective use of SOTES to their universal use, there was  
24 a legitimate concern that fear of receiving the occasional “low SOTE” would discourage  
25 faculty from taking necessary risks in their teaching. For example, faculty might avoid  
26 teaching experimental courses, developing new curriculum, take on last-minute  
27 assignments, or teaching unpopular courses as a risk-avoidance strategy. To reduce  
28 this perverse incentive, an “exclusionary rule” was included so faculty could exclude the  
29 occasional outlier SOTE from their evaluations, provided that there would still be a very  
30 large number of SOTES remaining in their personnel files.  
31

32 The language in the original policy ran into technical ambiguities having to do with how  
33 much teaching a faculty member needed to do to be allowed exercise this annual  
34 exclusion. The Spring 2019 draft of this policy clarified that language, while leaving  
35 unchanged from the original policy the requirement that all courses (other than those  
36 with fewer than 5 students) are surveyed with SOTES, and these results are available  
37 for review by department Chairs and become part of the personnel file. The  
38 “exclusionary rule” only concerns which results are subsequently placed in the “working  
39 personnel file” (known informally as dossiers) for formal evaluation purposes.  
40

42  
43 Unfortunately, the Spring 2019 amendment raised new issues with the CBA having to  
44 do with special session courses and the need to assure that evaluations of faculty  
45 teaching never rely solely on SOTEs. The Spring 2019 draft was therefore returned to  
46 Professional Standards unsigned by the President with instructions to consult with the  
47 Senior Associate Vice President, University Personnel, and the Senior Vice Provost  
48 Academic Affairs. Professional Standards has consulted with these officers, and has  
49 revised the amendment accordingly. PS has inserted language in several additional  
50 places in the policy making it an explicit requirement that any evaluation of faculty  
51 teaching must be “holistic,” which requires not only SOTEs but also direct observations  
52 and other teaching materials such as syllabi and input from the faculty member such as  
53 via an “Annual Summary of Achievements” form (ASA) pursuant to University Policy  
54 S10-7. We have further clarified that this requirement applies to both regular and  
55 special session courses.

56  
57 Approved: September 26, 2019 by email vote following discussion on  
58 September 23, 2019.  
59 Vote: 10-0-0  
60 Present: He, Riley, Chin, Cargill, Peter, Monday, Kumar, Mahendra, Kemnitz,  
61 Birrer.  
62 Absent: None.  
63 Financial Impact: No direct impacts  
64 Workload Impact: No direct impacts

65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81

82 **Policy Recommendation**  
83 **Evaluation in Effectiveness in Teaching**  
84 **For all Faculty**

85  
86 Effectiveness in teaching is the primary consideration in evaluating  
87 most faculty members' performance. (In the case of faculty who do not  
88 teach, or who teach rarely, some or all of the provisions of this policy  
89 may be waived by the appropriate college dean.) When evaluating  
90 effectiveness in teaching, chairs, committees, and administrators are  
91 required to conduct a holistic evaluation. This means that teaching  
92 must be considered in context and must be evaluated using multiple  
93 sources of information, such as direct observations, surveys of student  
94 opinion of teaching effectiveness (SOTES), course syllabi, and other  
95 teaching materials. The requirement to conduct a holistic evaluation of  
96 teaching applies to tenure/tenure track faculty as well as to lecturers,  
97 and it applies to teaching whether it is conducted in regular or special  
98 sessions. The factors to be considered include the following  
99 categories:

100  
101 ....

102  
103 C. Direct Observation by Peers. As one component of the evaluation  
104 of teaching, faculty will be observed by their peers. These direct  
105 observations are designed to evaluate teaching within the broad  
106 context of factors "A" and "B" cited above. Direct observations may  
107 consist of visits to the classroom, laboratory, or supervisory sessions.  
108 For courses with majority electronic or online content, direct  
109 observations will consist of peer observers experiencing the course  
110 content from the vantage-point of the students. Each faculty  
111 evaluation should include at least one direct observation, which may  
112 be made in either regular or special session classes.

113  
114 ....

115  
116 E. Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness Surveys (SOTES);  
117 both Qualitative and Quantitative

119 ....

120

121 4. Other than those classes excluded in E3 (above), SOTES shall  
122 be administered in all classes with enrollments of 5 or more students.  
123 In courses with enrollments of 5-9 students, faculty may choose that  
124 SOTES not be administered in the course. Results of SOTE  
125 evaluations will be placed in the faculty personnel file. ~~Faculty,~~  
126 ~~however, under some circumstances may exclude the results of an~~  
127 ~~occasional course from their periodic evaluations.~~ Faculty may choose  
128 to exclude the survey results from one course per Academic year from  
129 their periodic evaluations, provided that they teach at least fifteen units  
130 of courses WTUs (equivalent of five typical three unit courses in either  
131 regular and/or special sessions) evaluated via the SOTE instrument  
132 during that year Academic Year. ~~Faculty who are credited with~~  
133 ~~teaching double sized courses will be credited with teaching twice the~~  
134 ~~normal number of units.~~ (Issues in interpreting the 15 WTU  
135 requirement shall be resolved by the Provost or designee.) For this  
136 purpose, the “year” shall correspond to the review cycle of the faculty  
137 member; i.e., for tenured/tenure-track faculty beginning in Fall; for  
138 lecturer faculty beginning in Spring. When the periodic review covers  
139 multiple years, only one course in any year may be excluded, and the  
140 remaining SOTES shall be representative of the teaching assignment.

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155



1 **San José State University**  
2 **Academic Senate**  
3 **Organization and Government Committee**  
4 **October 7, 2019**  
5 **First Reading**  
6

**AS 1735**

7 **Policy Recommendation**  
8 **Amendment A to University Policy F15-13**  
9 **Updating the Board of General Studies Membership, Charge,**  
10 **and Responsibilities**

11  
12 Legislative History: F15-13 (Updating the Board of General Studies Membership,  
13 Charge, and Responsibilities) rescinded S96-9 and S02-7 and is our current policy  
14 articulating the membership, charge, and responsibilities for the Board of General  
15 Studies (BOGS).

16  
17 Whereas, Location of the committee reviewing proposals for GE (General Education)  
18 courses within the infrastructure of university committees has been  
19 reviewed by the Organization and Government Committee, and  
20

21 Whereas, The membership and responsibilities of such a committee indicates it is  
22 best situated as an operating committee reporting to the Curriculum and  
23 Research Committee, and  
24

25 Whereas: This change is consistent with EO 1100, therefore be it  
26

27 Resolved: That F15-13 be amended as provided in this recommendation, and be it  
28 further  
29

30 Resolved: That the name for the group responsible for matters related to GE be the  
31 General Education Advisory Committee, and be it further  
32

33 Resolved: To ensure the broadest possible input on changes to the GE guidelines,  
34 the group charged with review of the GE guidelines will confer broadly  
35 across campus with groups including faculty (lecturers and  
36 Tenured/Tenure Track) teaching AI courses and a broad range of GE  
37 courses, the Program Planning Committee, Undergraduate Studies  
38 Committee, associate deans, and the General Education Advisory  
39 Committee, and be it further  
40

41 Resolved: That for AY 2019-2020, proposed updates to the current General  
42 Education Guidelines take into consideration SJSU's GE Assessment  
43 Task Force recommendations and reflect the changes documented here,  
44 and be it further  
45

46 Resolved: That the Senate initiate a process for subsequent reviews of SJSU's GE  
47 Guidelines at least every five years. Subsequent reviews will be  
48 conducted initially by a task force chaired by the Senate's Vice chair and  
49 include representatives from the Program Planning Committee,  
50 Undergraduate Studies Committee, the General Education Advisory  
51 Committee, and faculty (including lecturers) teaching AI and GE. The  
52 recommendations from this task force will be forwarded to the C&R  
53 committee for final review.  
54

55 Rationale: The Board of General Studies (BOGS) is presently constituted as a  
56 committee under the category "other" with no direct reporting responsibilities to the  
57 Curriculum and Research Policy Committee. Neither its membership nor its  
58 responsibilities call for the board to reside outside the infrastructure of university  
59 committees. With one representative from each of the academic colleges, a student,  
60 and appropriate ex-officio members it is comparable to other operating committees  
61 reporting to the Curriculum and Research policy committee.  
62

63 Furthermore, removal of the review of GVAR courses from this policy is recommended  
64 as the University Writing Committee (UWC) is where expertise with respect to writing  
65 competence resides. The University Writing policy (S19-3) provides the specifications  
66 and responsibilities (for the UWC) related to Written communication reside.  
67

68 With respect to future reviews of SJSU's GE guidelines, a task force with broadly  
69 representative membership will be an important component of campus-wide  
70 consideration of future changes to the GE program.  
71

72  
73 Approved: 9/30/19  
74 Vote: 9-0-0  
75 Present: Altura, French, Grosvenor, Higgins, Jackson, Lemon,  
76 Millora, Okamoto, Shifflett  
77 Absent: Gallo, Korani, McClory  
78

79 Financial Impact: None  
80 Workload Impact: Additional coordination between the Associate Vice Chair of the  
81 Senate and the GEAC chair; Decrease in workload for college offices that would  
82 otherwise conduct elections.  
83

84  
85 Reference information for the Senate:  
86

87 <http://www.sjsu.edu/senate/docs/F15-13.pdf>  
88 <http://www.sjsu.edu/gup/ugs/faculty/ge/guidelines/index.html>  
89 <https://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1100-rev-8-23-17.pdf> (see section 6.2.2 & 6.2.5)

Board of General Studies General Education Advisory Committee  
Membership, Charge, and Responsibilities

1. ~~Board of General Studies~~ **General Education Advisory Committee**

The General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) shall be an operating committee reporting to the Curriculum and Research Policy Committee. Executive order 1100 (which superseded EO 1065) provides guidance on a range of issues including implementation and governance pertaining to CSU General Education Breadth Requirements. Specifically, section 6.2.2 3 notes that “each campus shall have a broadly representative GE committee, a majority of which shall be instructional faculty and shall also include student membership. The committee will provide oversight and make recommendations concerning the implementation, conduct, and evaluation of requirements specified in this executive order. As a companion to the GE committee, a campus may choose to establish a GE program assessment committee to conduct the work described in 6.2.5 of this executive order.”

1.1 Charge

~~BOGS~~ The GEAC ~~receives and solicits courses and reviews curricular proposals designed to satisfy General Education (GE), and the American Institutions (AI) graduation requirement, and Graduation Writing Assessment Requirements (GWAR) from all colleges and departments of the University; provides support to departments seeking to develop GE, or AI, or GWAR courses; reviews, recommends approvals, and authorizes of new courses and curricular proposals for purposes of GE, and AI, and GWAR; reviews the GE portion of materials submitted in the program planning process; and evaluates the courses and curricula proposed it has approved according to ~~procedures described in the current 2014 GE Guidelines.~~ The ~~Board~~ GEAC evaluates modifications requested by degree programs in accordance with the current 2014 Guidelines.~~

1.2 Membership. College faculty representatives shall be tenured or tenure track faculty. Whenever possible, faculty appointments should be made on the basis of interest, competence, and experience teaching General Education curricula. The at-large faculty seats should be used to provide the committee with expertise in areas of general education not covered by college faculty representatives. At large seats, when possible, should be filled with lecturers.

AVP ~~Graduate & Undergraduate Studies Programs~~ or designee (EXO, non voting)  
Director of Assessment (EXO, non voting)

1 faculty Business

1 faculty Education

1 faculty Engineering

1 faculty Health and Human Sciences

1 faculty Humanities & the Arts

1 faculty Science

- 132 1 faculty Social Sciences  
133 1 to 3 faculty-at-large (GE area representatives)  
134 1 Student

135 1.2.1 ~~Election and Appointment of Members~~

136 1.2.1.1 ~~The faculty members of the Board shall be elected by the faculty~~  
137 ~~electorate in each college in an election administered by the Dean's office. Each~~  
138 ~~department in a college shall be informed of a pending election and shall~~  
139 ~~nominate one tenured faculty member.~~

140 Each non-ex officio faculty member will initially serve a 3-year term renewable  
141 for one additional 3-year term. Faculty can return to serve in future years (after a  
142 break in service) when a seat becomes available. Student members serve a  
143 one-year term and can be re-appointed. Recruitment of applicants to serve on  
144 the GEAC will be done through the normal Committee on Committees process  
145 for the seats designated for a faculty member and student. Each person  
146 seeking nomination shall prepare a brief statement summarizing her/his  
147 experience (including GE area of teaching) and interest in General Education.

148  
149 When there are multiple applications for a seat, the Executive Committee of the  
150 Academic Senate will recommend individuals to serve. Selection of faculty shall  
151 be based on interest, competence, and experience teaching in the General  
152 Education curricula; selection shall also consider the need to have GE areas  
153 represented. Student appointments should be made on the basis of interest,  
154 experience in the General Education curricula, and a scholastic record of  
155 academic excellence.

156  
157 When a seat will be vacant for no more than 1 semester (e.g., sabbatical or  
158 leave of absence) an interim appointment can be made following normal  
159 Committee on Committee processes. Any seat that will be vacant for a year or  
160 more will require a replacement for the remainder of the term associated with  
161 that seat.

162  
163 1.2.1.2 ~~Prior to the departmental nomination, each person seeking nomination~~  
164 ~~shall prepare and circulate to the department faculty a brief (not more than 100~~  
165 ~~words) statement summarizing her/his experience and objectives in General~~  
166 ~~Education.~~

167 1.2.1.3 ~~The college curriculum committee shall select not more than three of~~  
168 ~~those nominated to place before the college electorate. The college curriculum~~  
169 ~~committee may choose to meet and consult with the Provost (or designee) prior~~  
170 ~~to making the selection.~~

171 1.2.1.4 ~~Selection by each college curriculum committee shall be based on~~  
172 ~~interest, competence, and experience in the General Education curricula; the~~  
173 ~~statements prepared by departmental nominees shall be considered.~~

174 ~~1.2.1.5. Faculty shall serve three-year staggered terms. When a full-term~~  
175 ~~vacancy is to be filled, or a vacancy for an unexpired term of more than one~~  
176 ~~year, applications shall be solicited from the college, and an election held as~~  
177 ~~provided above.~~

178 ~~1.2.1.6. Vacancies of one year or less shall be filled for the balance of the~~  
179 ~~unexpired term. The college curriculum committee in consultation with the Dean~~  
180 ~~shall select a member to fill the vacancy. Consideration shall be given to, among~~  
181 ~~others, those who applied for the last vacancy for which college-wide solicitation~~  
182 ~~was required.~~

183 ~~1.2.1.7. A faculty member of the Board may be granted a leave for one~~  
184 ~~semester. A one semester interim appointment may then be made as provided~~  
185 ~~in 1.2.1.6.~~

186 ~~1.2.1.8. If a college is unable to elect a faculty member to the Board, then the~~  
187 ~~position will be filled for one year by the college curriculum committee in~~  
188 ~~consultation with the Dean.~~

189 ~~1.2.1.9. Student appointments should be made on the basis of interest,~~  
190 ~~experience in the General Education curricula, and a scholastic record of~~  
191 ~~academic excellence. Student members of the Board shall be appointed by the~~  
192 ~~Provost in consultation with the elected members of the Executive Committee~~  
193 ~~and the Associated Students President.~~

194 ~~1.2.1.10. Student appointees shall serve one-year terms and may seek~~  
195 ~~independent study credit by working with the Chair of BOGS.~~

196

197 ~~1.2.2 The Chair shall be a faculty member with at least one year of service on the~~  
198 ~~Board. College faculty representatives through a vote will select the chair from among~~  
199 ~~those with continuing appointments before the end of the spring semester for the~~  
200 ~~subsequent year. The chair will be a tenured faculty member from the committee, with~~  
201 ~~at least one year of service on GEAC, selected each spring by faculty members with~~  
202 ~~continuing appointments for the subsequent year. appointed by the Provost in~~  
203 ~~consultation with the Senate Executive Committee.~~

204

205 ~~1.2.3 Ex officio members will be non-voting members. with the exception that in the~~  
206 ~~case of ties, the AVP or his/her designee to the committee may vote.~~

207

208 ~~1.2.4 If a member is absent from three regularly scheduled committee meetings in an~~  
209 ~~academic year the chair of the GEAC BOGS may request that the Associate Vice Chair~~  
210 ~~of the Senate initiate action leading to the election appointment of a new member for the~~  
211 ~~remainder of that seat's term. If a member repeatedly does not perform assigned~~  
212 ~~committee duties, the chair of the GEAC BOGS may request that the Associate Vice~~

213 Chair of the Senate initiate action leading to the appointment ~~election~~ of a new member  
214 for the remainder of that seat's term.

215  
216 **4.3-2.0 Responsibilities of the General Education Advisory Committee** ~~Board of~~  
217 ~~General Studies~~

218  
219 ~~1.3.1 The Board shall report to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.~~

220  
221 2.1 Members are expected to carry out their responsibilities in an unbiased, respectful,  
222 and collegial manner.

223  
224 2.2 ~~1.3.2~~ Members are expected to know the current Guidelines for GE and AI. and  
225 ~~GWAR.~~

226  
227 2.3 ~~1.3.3~~ As needed, the GEAC ~~Board shall~~ may actively solicit ~~courses and~~ curricular  
228 proposals ~~designed to~~ satisfy General Education requirements from all colleges and  
229 departments of the University. It shall review and, where appropriate, make  
230 recommendations related to the approval of new courses and curricular proposals. The  
231 GEAC will also review the GE portion of materials submitted in the program planning  
232 process and provide its recommendations, in writing, to the Program Planning  
233 Committee and the relevant department. ~~for purposes of General Education, and shall~~  
234 ~~evaluate existing GE, AI, and GWAR courses and curricula in a timely manner.~~

235  
236 2.4 ~~1.3.4~~ The committee ~~Board,~~ in consultation with the appropriate college deans and  
237 department chairpersons, shall provide for and ~~approve~~ recommend to the Curriculum  
238 and Research Committee modifications to requirements requested by degree programs  
239 in accordance with the 2014 current Guidelines.

240  
241 2.5 ~~1.3.5~~ Policy proposals affecting General Education curricula shall be brought to the  
242 Academic Senate by the Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R). The Organization  
243 and Government Committee shall present policy proposals relating to the charge,  
244 membership, and responsibilities of the GEAC ~~BOGS.~~

245  
246 2.6 ~~1.3.6~~ Annually, early in Fall Semester, the ~~Board~~ GEAC chair will provide for the  
247 Senate and the Curriculum and Research Committee a written report on its activities for  
248 the preceding academic year.

249  
250 2.7 ~~1.3.7~~ ~~In accordance with the 2014 Guidelines,~~ ~~BOGS is responsible for the~~  
251 ~~assessment and continuing certification of GE, AI, and GWAR courses.~~

252  
253 2.7 The GEAC shall liaise with SJSU GE coordinators, college curriculum committees,  
254 and the CSU GE Advisory Council to facilitate communication as needed.

255  
256 2.8 ~~As part of its program planning process, the GEAC is encouraged to~~ shall solicit  
257 input from campus stakeholders and take into consideration the feedback from previous  
258 institutional accreditation reviews, WASG and the GEAC's previous program plan and

259 related reports. Any proposed modifications shall be forwarded to C&R for final review,  
260 and consideration by the Senate, before implementation.

261  
262 2.9 The GEAC will participate in the periodic review of current GE guidelines.

263  
264  
265 **3.0 1.4 Procedures**

266  
267 3.1 1.4.1 Meetings of the Board committee shall be open to the campus community,  
268 except in cases where the GEAC BOGS elects to conduct votes in closed session.

269  
270 3.2 1.4.2 Review of New GE Course Proposals. Departmental representatives  
271 (normally the faculty who developed/teach the course ~~co~~ordinators and chairs/directors)  
272 shall be invited in a timely manner by the GEAC BOGS to attend, as needed, during the  
273 committee's review of new curricular proposals, Board meetings at which their course(s)  
274 will be discussed. No vote to recommend rejection of a proposal shall be taken until  
275 departmental representatives have been invited to a discussion of their proposal.

276  
277 3.2.1 1.4.5 If the GEAC Board plans to proposes to reject ~~denies certification of~~  
278 a new course proposal, it shall provide the department chair ~~course coordinator~~  
279 and C&R with written feedback, explaining the ~~reasons for a recommendation~~  
280 decision recommendation not to approve and an opportunity to meet with the  
281 GEAC to discuss the recommendation and provide additional documentation as  
282 needed. Denial. If the Board recommends to the Curriculum and Research (C&R)  
283 Committee that a course be decertified, it shall provide C&R and the course  
284 coordinator with written feedback explaining the reasons for the recommended  
285 decertification. For both new and continuing certification, The GEAC Board may  
286 not raise in subsequent proceedings on the same course additional objections,  
287 except those that apply to new materials submitted.

288  
289 3.2.2 All final recommendations from the GEAC pertaining to new curricular  
290 proposals shall be forwarded to the administrator designated by the Provost to  
291 receive recommendations regarding new GE curricular proposals.

292  
293 3.3 Periodic Review of Existing GE Courses. GE courses will be periodically reviewed  
294 by the GEAC as called for in SJSU's Program Planning Policy (S17-11). Following its  
295 review of the GE materials from a department's program planning documentation, the  
296 GEAC will forward its written recommendations to the Program Planning Committee and  
297 the relevant department.

298  
299 3.4 1.4.3 At the committee's ~~Board's~~ discretion, discipline-specific faculty will be invited  
300 to participate in discussions concerning new curricular proposals when the GEAC ~~board~~  
301 determines additional expertise is needed.

302  
303 3.5 1.4.4 The GEAC Board may appoint ad hoc General Education Review Panels  
304 (GRP) ~~Advisory Panels (GEAPs)~~. Each GRP shall be focused on a specific curricular

305 requirement or set of requirements that is under the purview of the GEAC Board. The  
306 creation of GRPs shall be at the discretion of the committee Board, except for the  
307 American Institutions GRP which is required. A GRP may be an ad-hoc group  
308 constituted for the short duration needed to review and subsequently advise the GEAC  
309 Board on specific proposals. ~~pertaining to certification or continuing certification.~~

310  
311 3.5.1 ~~4.4.4.1~~ Purpose. A GRP shall provide the GEAC Board with advice drawn  
312 from disciplinary expertise and may assist the committee Board with the  
313 workload associated with reviewing ~~and assessing~~ new courses associated with  
314 a particular curricular requirement.

315  
316 3.5.2 ~~4.4.4.2~~ Membership. The membership of Review Advisory Panels shall be  
317 determined by the Board GEAC but shall be no less than three persons, and  
318 shall consist of individuals with subject-matter expertise and teaching experience  
319 relevant to the particular curricular requirement. The GEAC chair will work with  
320 the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate to organize outreach to constitute a  
321 GRP.

322  
323 3.5.2.1 ~~4.4.4.3~~ American Institutions. The American Institutions GRP shall  
324 include, at a minimum, a representative with a doctorate in Political  
325 Science who specializes in American and California Government, a  
326 representative with a doctorate in History who specializes in United States  
327 History, and a representative who has taught American Institutions  
328 requirements in an interdisciplinary context outside of the Political Science  
329 and History departments. The AI review panel may advise the GEAC  
330 Board on the GE content of curricular proposals that seek to meet both AI  
331 and GE requirements, and it will advise the GEAC Board on the AI content  
332 of all curricular proposals that seek to meet AI requirements. The GEAC  
333 Board will strongly consider the panel's advice. In the event that the GEAC  
334 Board rules differently than the AI panel, the GEAC board will provide the  
335 rationale for its ruling and members of the review panel may appeal the  
336 ruling to the Curriculum and Research Committee for a final decision.

337  
338  
339 3.6 ~~4.4.6~~ If the GEAC Board would like to propose modifications to the guidelines  
340 regarding criteria for approval of GE courses ~~certification or continuing certification~~ in  
341 addition to those prescribed by university policy, these proposed changes to the  
342 guidelines shall be submitted to the Curriculum and Research Committee for policy  
343 review and, if approved, will subsequently be made available to all course coordinators  
344 and department chairs.

345  
346 3.7 ~~4.4.7~~ The GEAC Board may make additional rules for the conduct of its  
347 proceedings, but they must be consistent with university policy.

348  
349 4.0 ~~4.5.~~ **Assessment of the General Education Program**

350



351 4.1 4.5.4 The GEAC will be consulted when GE program-level learning outcomes are  
352 developed or modified.

353  
354 4.2 In collaboration with the Director for Assessment, and any other entity charged with  
355 assessment of the General Education Program overall, GEAC, as needed, will be  
356 consulted regarding plans for assessment of the GE program as expressed in EO 1100  
357 section 6.2.5.

358  
359  
360 ~~5.0.2. Subsequent Review of Guidelines~~ -- NOTE: Deleted this section but information  
361 relocated to resolved and sections 2.9 and 3.6.

362  
363 ~~5.1 The Academic Senate, in AY 2019-2020, should direct the GEAC Board of General~~  
364 ~~Studies to conduct the next full review of the Guidelines for GE, AI, and GVAR.~~

365 ~~5.2 The GEAC is encouraged to take into consideration the feedback from WASC, the~~  
366 ~~program plan, and the external reviewer's report.~~

7 **Policy Recommendation**  
8 **Amendment B to University Policy S16-8**  
9 **Selection and Review of Administrators**

10

11 Legislative History: S16-8, followed by amendments in Spring 2017, constitute current  
12 policy on the selection and review of administrators.

13

14

15 Whereas: Organizational changes have resulted in positions with responsibilities  
16 directly connected to faculty residing outside of academic affairs, and

17

18 Whereas: Organizational changes have resulted in the establishment of director  
19 positions previously titled Associate/Assistant Vice President, and

20

21 Whereas: Re-titled positions are at a level and with responsibilities such that they  
22 need to be included in S16-8, therefore, be it

23

24 Resolved That section 1.1 of S16-8 be amended as follows:

25

26 1.1 Applicability. This policy applies to searches for and reviews of Management  
27 Personnel Plan (MPP) administrators who serve university-wide as vice  
28 presidents; those within the Academic Affairs Division including the provost,  
29 ~~deputy Vice~~ provosts, deans and all other associate vice presidents or  
30 equivalent positions; and these positions: Senior Director, Faculty Affairs, and  
31 Director, Center for Faculty Development, and the Associate Vice President of  
32 the Office of Research. ~~Where not otherwise specified, the words 'academic~~  
33 ~~administrators' as used in this policy means all those only the above positions in~~  
34 ~~the Academic Affairs Division.~~

35

36 and be it further,

37

38 Resolved That section 1.3 of S16-8 be amended as follows:

39

40 1.3 Composition of Search Committees. Committees shall be large enough to allow for  
41 sufficiently broad representation, yet small enough so as not to be unwieldy. When  
42 feasible, an odd number of voting members will be appointed to eliminate the possibility  
43 of tied votes. Faculty, students, administrators and staff shall be represented.

44 Consideration should be given to representation of the diversity of the campus. Faculty  
45 shall comprise a majority on all search committees for administrators in the Academic

46 Affairs Division, inclusive of the Director, Center for Faculty Development, a majority on  
47 search committees for the Senior Director, Faculty Affairs and the Associate Vice  
48 President of the Office of Research; and at least one third of other committees. If  
49 appropriate, alumni and community representatives may serve on search committees.

50  
51 and be it further,

52  
53 Resolved: That section 2.2 of S16-8 be amended as follows

54  
55 For all offices covered by this policy, a review committee shall be appointed and  
56 constituted in accordance with the procedures specified in Part 1, Sections 1.3 and 1.4  
57 of this policy. The ~~Provost~~ Vice Presidents shall not be eligible to serve on committees  
58 to review ~~academic~~ administrators in their division.

59  
60  
61 Rationale: -With position titles and location of positions within the university recently  
62 changed it was necessary to review the policy on selection and review of administrators.  
63 The changes proposed here allow for search and review committees to have a majority  
64 of faculty in cases where, regardless of division, the position has responsibilities that  
65 impact faculty teaching, research, service, RTP/evaluations, or professional  
66 development.

67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72 Approved: Approved: 8/26/19  
73 Vote: 10-0-0  
74 Present: Altura, French, Gallo, Grosvenor, Higgins, Jackson, Millora, McClory,  
75 Okamoto, Shifflett  
76 Absent: —  
77 Financial Impact: None  
78 Workload Impact: None

7 **Senate Management Resolution**  
8 **Rescind and Replace SM-F09-2**  
9 **Charge and Membership of the Academic Disqualification**  
10 **and Reinstatement Review Committee**  
11

12  
13 Legislative History: The charge and membership information for the Academic  
14 Disqualification and Reinstatement Review Committee (ADRRRC) resides in S19-2  
15 (which modified SM-F09-2). This proposal would rescind that Senate Management  
16 resolution and update the committee's membership with a new Senate Management  
17 Resolution.

18  
19 Whereas: An update to the charge and membership of committees has recently  
20 been approved (S19-2), and

21  
22 Whereas: The ADRRRC has requested changes consistent with organizational  
23 restructuring that created a college of graduate studies, therefore be it

24  
25 Resolved: That SM-F09-2 be rescinded and that the charge and membership for the  
26 ADDRC would be as follows.

27  
28 Charge: Enforces and reviews academic regulations governing disqualification and  
29 reinstatement to the University. Serves as the review committee for students whose  
30 petitions have been denied for Change of Major/Adding a second major/or minor for  
31 students with more than 90 units, per PD 2009-05.

32  
33 Membership:

34  
35 Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education [EXO]  
36 Director or designee Advising and Retention Services [EXO]  
37 AVP, Student Affairs  
38 ~~AVP Faculty & Student Success or Designee~~ [EXO]  
39 Director or designee Counseling Services [EXO]  
40 Associate Dean Business [EXO]  
41 Associate Dean Education [EXO]  
42 Associate Dean Engineering [EXO]  
43 Associate Dean Graduate Studies [EXO]  
44 Associate Dean Health and Human Sciences [EXO]  
45 Associate Dean Humanities and the Arts [EXO]

46 Associate Dean Science [EXO]  
47 Associate Dean Social Sciences [EXO]  
48 College of Professional and Global Education ~~International and Extended Studies~~  
49 (CPGE ~~IES~~) Associate Dean [EXO]  
50  
51 Rationale: Changes in organizational structure have resulted in the need for changes  
52 that add the Associate Dean of the new College of Graduate Studies, update the title for  
53 the CPGE, and removes the AVP Faculty & Student Success seat.  
54  
55  
56 Approved: 9/30/19  
57 Vote: 9-0-0  
58 Present: Altura, French, Gallo, Grosvenor, Higgins, Jackson,  
59 Millora, Okamoto, Shifflett, Lemon,  
60 Absent: Korani, McClory, Korani  
61 Financial Impact: None  
62 Workload Impact: None

1 **San José State University**  
2 **Academic Senate**  
3 **Organization and Government Committee**  
4 **October 7, 2019**  
5 **Final Reading**  
6

**AS 1748**

7 **Policy Recommendation**  
8 **Adding General Unit Seats to the Student Evaluation Review**  
9 **Board, Student Fairness Committee, University Library**  
10 **Board, and University Writing Committee**  
11 **[Amendment B to University Policy F10-2,**  
12 **Amendment B to University Policy S14-3,**  
13 **Amendment B to S15-10,**  
14 **Amendment A to University Policy S19-3]**  
15

16 Legislative History: The membership information for the Student Evaluation Review  
17 Board resides in F10-2 (charge updated with S19-2); The updated membership  
18 information for the Student Fairness Committee resides in S19-2 (which amended S14-  
19 3); The membership information for the University Writing Committee resides in S19-3.  
20 The membership information for the University Library Board resides in S15-10 (charge  
21 updated with S19-2). This proposal would add a General Unit Seat to these  
22 Committees.  
23

24 **Whereas:** Changes in the home college for departments originally in the College of  
25 Health and Human Sciences have taken place, and  
26

27 **Whereas:** For the School of Information and faculty in Applied Data Science, their  
28 affiliation with the College of Professional and Global Education (CPGE)  
29 means their faculty are now part of the General Unit, therefore be it  
30

31 **Resolved:** That F10-2, S14-3, S15-10, and S19-3 be amended by adding a general  
32 unit seat to the Student Evaluation Review Board, Student Fairness  
33 Committee, University Library Board, and University Writing Committee as  
34 noted on the following pages.  
35

36 **Rationale:** Since the School of Information and Applied Data Science are now affiliated  
37 with a college that has not in the past included faculty, reflection related to  
38 representation on committees for faculty in the general unit was needed. A review of  
39 the membership for all committees was conducted and it was determined that faculty  
40 from the CPGE, through their membership in the general unit, needed an opportunity to  
41 serve on the Student Evaluation Review Board, Student Fairness Committee, University  
42 Library Board, and University Writing Committee.  
43

44 **Approved:** 9/30/19

45 Vote: 9-0-0  
46 Present: Altura, French, Grosvenor, Higgins, Jackson, Lemon,  
47 Millora, Okamoto, Shifflett  
48 Absent: Korani, Gallo, McClory  
49  
50 Financial Impact: None  
51 Workload Impact: None  
52  
53

54 Proposed changes

55  
56 For F10-2; Amendment B; update information on SERB membership to read:

57  
58 Membership:  
59 Director, Center for Faculty Development or designee [EXO]  
60 ~~Associate Vice President~~ Director, office of Institutional Research or designee [EXO]  
61 1 Faculty, College of Business  
62 1 Faculty, College of Education  
63 1 Faculty, College of Engineering  
64 ~~1 Member~~ Faculty, General Unit  
65 1 Faculty, College of Health and Human Sciences  
66 1 Faculty, College of Humanities & Arts  
67 1 Faculty, College of Science  
68 1 Faculty, College of Social Science  
69 1 Student  
70

71 Note: F10-2 language: ~~The Board shall consist of one faculty member from each college, one~~  
72 ~~student, the Director of the Center for Faculty Development and Support or designee, ex officio,~~  
73 ~~and the Associate Vice President for Institutional Research or designee, ex officio.~~ To the  
74 extent possible, the Committee on Committees shall recruit faculty who are familiar with survey  
75 research and/or statistical analysis.  
76  
77

78 For S14-3; Amendment B; Update information on membership for Student Fairness  
79 Committee to read:

80  
81 Ombudsperson [EXO]  
82 2 University administrators (management)  
83 1 Faculty, College of Business  
84 1 Faculty, College of Education  
85 1 Faculty, College of Engineering  
86 1 Faculty, General Unit  
87 1 Faculty, College of Health and Human Sciences  
88 1 Faculty, College of Humanities & Arts  
89 1 Faculty, College of Science  
90 1 Faculty, College of Social Science  
91 2 Staff (non-management)  
92 8 Students  
93

94  
95 For S19-3; Amendment A; Update information for the University Writing Committee to  
96 read:

97  
98 The University Writing Committee shall be a ~~special agency~~ university committee reporting to  
99 the Curriculum & Research Committee and be composed of the following ~~49~~ members:

- 100
- 101 College dean (EXO; UWC Chair; Appointed by the Provost)
- 102 SJSU Writing Programs Administrator (WPA) (EXO)
- 103 SJSU Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) Director (EXO)
- 104 Writing Center director (EXO)
- 105 Coordinator of Multilingual Writing Support Services (EXO)
- 106 ~~AVP, Vice Provost, Undergraduate~~ Education Studies or designee (EXO)
- 107 Director of Testing (EXO; non voting)
- 108 Dean, College of Graduate Studies or designee (EXO)
- 109 2 faculty, Humanities & the Arts, with one from the
- 110 Department of Linguistics and Language Development
- 111 ~~4 faculty each from all other colleges.~~
- 112 1 Faculty, College of Business
- 113 1 Faculty, College of Education
- 114 1 Faculty, College of Engineering
- 115 1 Faculty, General Unit
- 116 1 Faculty, College of Health and Human Sciences
- 117 1 Faculty, College of Humanities & Arts
- 118 1 Faculty, College of Science
- 119 1 Faculty, College of Social Science
- 120 1 faculty, University Library
- 121 2 students, one undergraduate that has satisfied University Written Communication II, one
- 122 graduate student that has satisfied graduate writing requirements.

123  
124  
125 For S15-10; Amendment B; Update information for University Library Board to read:

126  
127 The University Library Board is a ~~special agency~~ committee of the Senate authorized both to  
128 formulate and recommend policy related to the Library, and also to advise the Dean of the  
129 University Library on the implementation of University policies and generally on Library  
130 operations, combining the traditionally separate roles of policy and operating committees. When  
131 the Board formulates new policies or modifies the existing policy for consideration, it shall report  
132 directly to the Academic Senate. The chair of the University Library Board shall present policy  
133 recommendations to the Senate.

- 134
- 135 Membership
- 136 Library Dean, ex officio, non-voting
- 137 Past Chair of the Academic Senate or FAL to the Executive Committee,
- 138 3 regular university library faculty (tenured or tenure-track) who represent different professional
- 139 specializations.
- 140 1 faculty, Business
- 141 1 faculty, Education
- 142 1 faculty, Engineering
- 143 1 Faculty, General Unit



- 144 1 faculty, Health and Human Sciences
- 145 1 faculty, Humanities and the Arts
- 146 1 faculty, Science
- 147 1 faculty, Social Science
- 148 1 faculty member from the School of Library and Information Science
- 149 AS President or designee [EXO]
- 150 1 undergraduate student
- 151 1 graduate student

1 **San José State University**  
2 **Academic Senate**  
3 **Organization and Government Committee**  
4 **October 7, 2019**  
5 **Final Reading**  
6

**AS 1749**

7  
8 **Policy Recommendation**  
9 **Amendment B to University Policy S13-9**  
10 **Merging, Dividing, Transferring, Eliminating Academic Units**

11  
12 Legislative History: Amendment A to S13-9 rescinded S06-7 (Merging, Dividing,  
13 Transferring, Eliminating Academic Units). This proposal would further amend S13-9.

14  
15 Whereas: S13-9 does not specify explicitly that a proposal to merge, divide, transfer,  
16 or eliminate a unit must be in writing, and

17  
18 Whereas: S13-9 does not specify that all the bulleted elements in section 3 of S13-9  
19 must be articulated before a vote, and

20  
21 Whereas: Clarification of these points would facilitate the effective implementation of  
22 S13-9, therefore be it

23  
24 Resolved: That S13-9 be amended as noted in this proposal.  
25 .  
26

27 Rationale: The referral to the Organization and Government committee highlighted the  
28 difficulties encountered in recent attempts to implement S13-9. For example, the policy  
29 does not specify that a proposal to merge, divide, transfer, or eliminate a unit must be in  
30 writing (though in section 8 it does mention a “copy” of the proposal). The serious nature  
31 of proposals to merge, divide, transfer, or eliminate units makes clarity in policy of  
32 particular importance. A clear understanding of implications for students, faculty, and  
33 staff is important and facilitates informed discussion and subsequent decisions.  
34

35  
36 Approved: 9/30/19

37 Vote: 9-0-0

38 Present: Altura, French, Grosvenor, Higgins, Jackson,  
39 Millora, Okamoto, Shifflett, Lemon

40 Absent: Gallo, McClory, Korani

41 Financial Impact: None

42 Workload Impact: Some additional work for Deans to prepare reports

## Merging, Dividing, Transferring, Eliminating Academic Units

1-When a proposal is made by an academic unit, college dean or the Provost (or other university authority) to divide or eliminate an academic unit, to merge it with another academic unit or to transfer it to another college, the basic principle established by this policy is that there should be opportunity for meaningful consultation with all affected academic departments, including faculty, staff, and students, before any such proposal is approved or implemented. Any associated termination of degree programs shall comply with UP-S99-4, Degree Termination.

2-Implementation of this principle requires that all affected academic units be informed of the proposed change in writing and allowed a reasonable time (best determined in consultation with the affected departments) to evaluate the proposal. In the spirit of meaningful consultation such written proposals should be provided ~~announced~~ at a point in the fall or spring ~~an academic~~ semester that provides sufficient time for affected faculty, staff, and students to consider the proposal and, in the case of faculty, to express their opinions by vote according to the policy on department voting rights (S17-6). Voting should not commence until after consultation and after the proposal has been made available for review for at least 15 duty days.

3-A proposal to divide, eliminate, or merge an academic unit has multiple and significant implications for the campus community. The process should be governed by consultation among all affected academic units. The consultation and subsequent proposal ~~should~~ must, at a minimum, specify ~~consider some or all of the following.~~ depending on the proposal.

- A. A rationale for the proposed organizational change
- B. Resource implications (e.g., space, facility usage)
- C. RTP implications
- D. Curriculum and accreditation implications
- E. Implications for students (e.g., degree completion, assistantships); lecturers, tenure track and tenured faculty (e.g., seniority, entitlements, academic assignments); and staff (e.g., positions/responsibilities)
- F. Implications for relationships with external stakeholders

4-In addition to consultation with the affected academic unit(s), ~~or,~~ development of a written proposal also requires consultation with the dean of any college(s) affected and the Provost.

5-The Provost will announce the timeline for voting on the written proposal. Faculty shall have no less than 5 and no more than 15 faculty duty days to vote.

6-The vote of the regular (tenured and tenure-track) faculty and the vote of the temporary faculty in the affected academic unit(s) shall be tallied and recorded

89 separately, and the vote of the faculty shall be advisory only. The results of the voting  
90 should be made public within 7 calendar days. Voting shall be conducted consistent  
91 with the voting rights afforded by the CBA and consistent with SS-S11-3.

92  
93 ~~7-~~If any parties involved in the process believe that policy was not followed, they may  
94 request a hearing before the Organization and Government Committee (O&G) of the  
95 Academic Senate within 20 faculty duty days after the results of the vote are  
96 announced. For O&G to proceed with a hearing, the request must make a clear case  
97 that meaningful consultation among affected faculty did not occur ~~in order for O&G to~~  
98 ~~proceed with a hearing~~. O&G will not evaluate the merits of the proposed  
99 reorganization, only whether the principle of meaningful consultation was followed. At  
100 the hearing, all such academic units and authorities may be heard, as well as all faculty  
101 of affected academic units. After the hearing, the Organization and Government  
102 Committee shall make a written report to the Provost, the President, and the Academic  
103 Senate with its determination of whether meaningful consultation among all affected  
104 parties was achieved.

105  
106 ~~8-~~A copy of all approved successful proposals, as well as an account of the  
107 consultation process, will be archived by the Academic Senate to serve as a resource to  
108 the University community. The dean's office of the affected college(s) will provide such  
109 an account and the written approved proposal.

110  
111 ~~9-~~Processes to merge, divide, or eliminate Academic Departments in progress as of  
112 May 6, 2013 are covered under the existing policy.

113  
114 ~~10-~~Resolved that S06-7 be rescinded.