**SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE**

**2017/2018**

**Agenda**

**November 20, 2017, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm**

**Engineering 285/287**

**I. Call to Order and Roll Call –**

**II. Approval of Minutes:**
Senate Minutes of October 23, 2017

**III. Communications and Questions:**

A. From the Chair of the Senate

B. From the President of the University

**IV. Executive Committee Report:**

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee
Executive Committee Minutes of October 16, 2017
Executive Committee Minutes of October 30, 2017

B. Consent Calendar –

C. Executive Committee Action Items –

**V. Unfinished Business:** None

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

A. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

***AS 1646, Policy Recommendation, Selection and Review of Department Chairs and Directors (Final Reading)***

***AS 1666, Policy Recommendation, Amendment F to S15-7, Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Procedures (Final Reading)***

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

***AS 1656, Policy Recommendation, Modification to Bylaw 1.10 Pertaining to Academic Deans (First Reading)***

***AS 1669, Policy Recommendation, Amendment to Senate Constitution Regarding Administrative Representatives (First Reading)***

***AS 1670, Senate Management Resolution, Rescind SM-S96-6: Lottery Funds Committee, Rescind SM-S01-1: Creating a Temporary External Relations Task Force, Rescind SM-F08-3: Membership of the Graduate Studies and Research Committee (Final Reading)***

***AS 1671, Senate Management Resolution, Addition to the Responsibilities of the Budget Advisory Committee Related to Lottery Funds (First Reading)***

C. University Library Board (ULB):
***AS 1672, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Library Policy (First Reading)***

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

E. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
***AS 1649, Policy Recommendation, Registration Priority and Amendment A to S73-4 (First Reading)***

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

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

**VIII. Special Committee Reports:**

**IX. New Business:**

**X. Adjournment:**

## 2017/2018 Academic Senate

## MINUTES
## October 23, 2017

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

**Ex Officio:**
Present: Frazier, Van Selst, Manzo, Lee, J.

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

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

**Students:**
Present: De Guzman, Gill, Busick, Donahue
Absent: Tran, Hospidales

**Alumni Representative:**
Present: Walters

**Emeritus Representative:**
Present: Buzanski

**Honorary Representative:**
Present: Lessow-Hurley

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

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

**COB Representatives:**
Present: Rodan, Bullen, He
Absent: None

**EDUC Representatives**:
Present: Marachi, Mathur
Absent: None

**ENGR Representatives:**
Present: Chung, Hamedi-Hagh
Absent: Sullivan-Green

**H&A Representatives:**
Present: Ormsbee, Khan, Riley, Bacich, McKee
Absent: None

**SCI Representatives:**
Present: Cargill, Kim
Absent: White, Rangasayee

**SOS Representatives:**
Present: Peter, Wilson, Curry, Liu, Hart
Absent: None

**II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–**
The minutes of October 9, 2017 were approved with no objection.

**III. Communications and Questions –**

**A. From the Chair of the Senate:**
Chair Frazier announced the Provost and President would not be present at the meeting today.

Chair Frazier attended the Senate Chair's meeting in Long Beach. Most of the discussion centered on Executive Orders 1100 and 1110.

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

**IV. Executive Committee Report:**

**A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:**

Executive Committee Minutes of September 11, 2017 **– No questions**
Executive Committee Minutes of September 25, 2017 **– No questions**
Executive Committee Minutes of October 2, 2017 **– No questions**

**B. Consent Calendar:**

There was no dissent to the consent calendar of October 23, 2017.

**C. Executive Committee Action Items:**

Chair Frazier presented ***AS 1663, Sense of the Senate Resolution, On the Timelines and Content of Executive Orders 1100 and 1110 (Final Reading).*** Chair Frazier presented an amendment, which was friendly, to remove "and be it further" from the first and second Whereas clauses and replace them with "and." **The Senate voted and AS 1663 passed as amended with no Nays or Abstentions**.

**V. Unfinished Business:** None

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

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

Senator Shifflett presented ***AS 1667, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Faculty Trustee Report for Academic Senate (Final Reading).***
**The Senate voted and AS 1667 passed as written with no Nays or Abstentions.**

Senator Shifflett presented ***AS 1669, Amendment to Senate Constitution Regarding Administrative Representatives (First Reading).***

**Questions:**

Q: I noticed in the Executive Committee minutes of September 11, 2017 that the committee had considered adding the AVP of Faculty Affairs as an ex officio member of the Senate, and that the committee recommended greater flexibility. Has the committee considered the preamble of the constitution that says to provide for effective participation and deliberation by the academic community at San José State University in the formulation and governing policies for the university.
A: The discussions in O&G have kept coming back to this is an "Academic" Senate and the Academic Division needs the representation to focus on Academic issues. This does not change the number of representatives that are administrators. As for the AVP for Faculty Affairs in particular, the committee did not feel comfortable identifying a particular position and putting that into the constitution.
Q: Did the committee consider that by outlining it in this way the constitution would then be limiting the representation from the academic administrators, namely those in Academic Affairs?
A: Because up until this point the AVP of Faculty Affairs was in the Academic

Affairs Division. I hear what you are saying. I can't say that we specifically talked about that, but I can say in the overall picture of things we did talk about academics being the central concern and representation needs to be strong.
Q: Would the committee consider instead of setting it up such that explicitly limits Academic Affairs in terms of its leadership, and rather expanding who could be considered as part of it? This would mean still leaving it at four, but in addition to those considered part of the Academic Affairs leadership team, also allowing for it to include AVPs from other divisions?
A: The committee will take it up again.
Q: There is still the option of having the Chair of the Senate recognize a speaker, so that option is still available.
A: Definitely, thank you.

Q: Couldn't the constitution just say four college deans or AVPs instead of being so specific?
A: My understanding from discussions in the committee is that this type of vague definition is what led to the need for an expanded definition of Academic Deans. At this point, O&G feels that being more specific in the constitution about what the representation is would be a good thing, and then keep the bylaws about process. However, we will explore being more generic.

---

Senator Shifflett presented ***AS 1656, Policy Recommendation, Modification of Bylaw 1.10 Pertaining to Academic Deans (First Reading)***.

**Question:**
Q: What would happen if sometime in the future a different Provost would abolish the position of a Deputy Provost?
A: We would be fine. The college deans would select the deans, the AVPs in Academic Affairs would select those AVPs, and the President would select the AVP from outside Academic Affairs. There would no longer be any reporting lines at all in the bylaw.

Q: We have a Deputy Provost, but that title may not fit any longer and that seat might need to be considered with the AVPs. Did O&G consider this?
A: O&G was asked to consider the Deputy Provost and O&G felt that the Provost already sits on the Senate.

Q: You have different selection processes here. The deans and AVPs each are choosing their representatives and the President is choosing an AVP, why the different mechanisms? Are the deans choosing their representatives now?
A: Yes, the deans do select their members including any academic AVPs right now. The reason the President is selecting the AVP outside of Academic Affairs is that there are 10 AVPs outside of Academic Affairs and they may not all know each other. The President in consultation with the Executive Committee might be in a better position to select the AVP outside Academic Affairs.

Q: As an example, the Senate leaves it up to Associated Students to select which students they think should serve on the Senate, so why not consider allowing the AVPs to select all their membership including whether they want someone from outside Academic Affairs?
A: The committee will consider this.

---

Senator Shifflett presented ***AS 1668, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds S88-7, Conditional Admissions (Final Reading).***
**The Senate voted and AS 1668 passed as written with no Nays and 1 Abstention**.

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

**C. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –**
Senator Peter presented ***AS 1666, Policy Recommendation, Amendment F to University Policy S15-7, Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Procedures Regarding Department Chair Participation on RTP Committees (First Reading)***.

**Questions:**
Q: If the University Council of Chairs and Directors (UCCD) has not already been consulted, please consider running the draft through that group?
A: It came from Professor Heiden on behalf of the UCCD originally, but we will run through them again.

Q: Is it required by the contract that an associate professor/chair would have the ability to write a comment on a full professor equal of a review?
A: We believe that part of our campus policy that prohibits an associate professor/chair from writing an opinion or joining a committee in the case of someone of higher rank is actually supported by the contract which has similar language, so we think we are safe on that one. However, it does create this weird aspect where two parts of the collective bargaining agreement appear to be in conflict with each other.

**D. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) –**
Senator Schultz-Krohn presented ***AS 1664, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Guidance on Implementation of EO 1064, Student Internships, Service Learning, and Off-Campus Learning Experiences (Final Reading).*** Senator Bacich presented an amendment that was friendly to add the word, "and" at the end of the third Whereas clause on line 39. **The Senate voted and AS 1664 passed as amended with no Nays or Abstentions.**

---

Senator Schultz-Krohn presented ***AS 1665, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds S08-7, Policy for Protection of Human Subjects (First Reading).***
Senator Mathur made a motion to suspend the standing rules and move the resolution to a final reading. The Mathur motion was seconded. The Senate voted

and the Mathur motion passed with 1 Nay and 3 Abstentions. Senator Van Selst presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change, "the current" to "forthcoming" on line 28. Senator Mathur presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to move, "Rescinds S08-7" from the title to the legislative history. **The Senate voted and AS 1665 passed as amended with no Nays and 2 Abstentions**.

**E. University Library Board (ULB) –** No report.

## VII. State of the University Announcements. Questions.

**A. CSU Statewide Senators:**
The GE Taskforce meets on Friday.

**B. Associated Students President (AS):**
Homecoming had a huge turnout this year.

Next week AS is hosting their scholarship reception and this year they gave out $75,000 in scholarships.

AS is hosting a Student Awareness Disability Fair on the 7th Street Plaza tomorrow from 10:30 a.m. to 2 p.m.

Senator Busick is working on an initiative for AS to get the crisis information printed on the back of the Tower card.

Students are concerned about what is getting reported out in the SJSU Alerts as well as having questions about Title IX.

AS is interested in getting the Student Health Advisory Committee (SHAC) made into an university committee. Right now there are students and administrators from all over the campus serving on the committee and it works out of the Student Wellness Center.

AS will be hosting a haunted house at the AS House next week.

**Questions:**
Q: Can you elaborate on what the concern is that students have about the alerts?
A: Students want to know why they get reports on some things and not on others. For instance, why weren't they informed about the body found on campus, but are informed about shootings outside campus. Students don't know the criteria about why certain things are sent out and others not sent out.

Q: Can you give us an update on the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) funding?
A: Yes, thank you for that. AS allocated up to $150,000 to the Economic

Crisis Response Team for DACA Scholarships. From that funding they were able to give out five scholarships and right now AS is looking into reimbursing students that were not aware these funds were available.

Q: How are you reaching students?
A: Through our Newsletter and other avenues.
Q: Would you mind sending this information to faculty so we can post on our websites?
A: Sure.

**C. Provost: No report, not present.**

**D. Vice President of Finance and Administration (VPAF):**
VP Faas just returned from three days of Clery training at the Chancellor's Office in Long Beach.

Clery reporting is pretty clear about what has to be reported. If something happens on our campus it has to be reported. If it is an event that can potentially impact our students on or around campus, we must report it. A student was accosted by someone with a gun at a housing facility off campus over the weekend. However, it was not reported to the campus until Monday morning. There is nothing timely about reporting an incident that happened several days prior. VP Faas spoke to the student and she understood that. Another incident involved a transient that passed away on a Sunday on a bench on campus. There was no foul play. The UPD called the coroner. There was no reason to report this to the campus as there was no danger. What VP Faas has started to do is to review the Sammy app on a regular basis to see what questions students have and what is being said so rumors don't fly around and the questions are answered by the right people. The Clery Act is very specific about what is reported and the timelines. The number of crimes we have had over the past few years has remained largely the same. The Clery Act came about as a result of the rape and death of a student named Jeanne Clery on a college campus 25 years ago. There were lots of crime around the area near that campus that were not reported to the students so they did not take precautions. Her parents started a foundation and got the Clery Act passed.

**Questions:**
Q: A few weeks ago a man attempted to attack one of our students in the residence halls, so what kind of security do we have there?
A: Good question. At 7 a.m. about two weeks ago outside CV2, a gentleman was hanging outside the building with a backpack on and wearing a hoodie. We reviewed the video. A group of students exit the building and see the guy and one student goes back and makes sure the door is shut. About 10 minutes later, a second group of students exit the building. This time no one shuts the door and the man slips inside. The students see him enter, but they do nothing. The guy walked by the front desk. The person at the desk had his head down and did not see the guy. This was failure number two. You cannot get into the second floor

elevator without a key card. The guy waits at the elevator until someone gets off then he gets on the elevator. He stays in the elevator until someone pushes the button for the elevator then he gets off on the second floor. Again, someone saw him when he exited the elevator, but said nothing. He is in the building for an hour. He goes into a bathroom and a female student comes out of the stall. This student's father happened to be a Marine, and she knew how to protect herself. She managed to get away and call for help. The guy then runs out, but not before the student got a good look at the guy. UPD got a lead on the guy after talking to San Jose Police and went and arrested him at a local elementary school. We can try and add more doors and take other security measures, but we must all be aware of who is around us and make an effort to report anyone suspicious. UPD had a meeting that night in the dorms and only 40 people showed up when we have 4,000 students living in the dorms.

**Questions:**
Q: Is there going to be any increase in the presence of UPD officers on campus. This helps deter these type of events.
A: Yes, VP Faas has talked to Chief Decena about increasing the visibility of UPD on campus. They have a new golf cart as well.

Q: If someone decides to speak at the university that needs extra security are we obligated to provide it no matter what the cost to the university and who pays for it if we are?
A: The money comes from our general budget. If there is a concert, speaker, or event that we book needs extra added security, we must provide it. We pool resources from other universities to assist.

Q: There is an enormous housing community in New York City that covers about 20 Square blocks called Stuyvesant Town. It is considered one of the safest places to live in New York. One of the house rules in Stuyvesant Town is never let anyone in behind you. If you have a neighbor coming in behind you, then they will have a key to let themselves in. No one gets in without a key. It takes some doing to close the door in someone's face, but people in Stuyvesant Town do that and it is very secure. Perhaps it is possible to create a culture with students where they understand it is better to be safe than friendly. Also, would it be possible to have a closed circuit TV for people at the desk to view who is around the front door area?
A: Yes. It is disappointing that the person at the desk did not look up. We are meeting tomorrow to look at ways to make this safer.

Q: I'm a resident adviser in one of the dorms and one of the changes that has been made since this happened is that the people at the desk now have to check everyone's badge when they come in.

**E. Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA) –**
Student Affairs takes the incident in the dorm very seriously. It is being addressed from all aspects including training our employees better, addressing the students in the doors, increasing security, etc.

Student Affairs has been involved in a lot of outreach this fall including reaching out to 250 students as a result of the fires and the shootings in Las Vegas. One of our students lost their home and another student's family lost their business. We have offered housing to those with need. Student Affairs has also sent a counselor to Sonoma State to assist as well.

Tomorrow is the Disability Awareness Fair and this is Disability Awareness Month. It is also Lesbian-Gay-Bisexual-Transgender Awareness Month as well and we had Dustin Lance Black who wrote the "Milk" screenplay here on October 9, 2017 to speak to students. November is Native American Heritage month and we have a kickoff event in the Student Union.

Applications were received from 3,672 students for graduation in fall 2017. Last year we had 3,275 students graduate.

Veteran's day is November 10, 2017. SJSU serves over 500 students who are veterans or in active duty status. Fall 2018 admission cycle is open. We received over 2,000 undergraduate applications and 300 graduate applications. We had about 50% more than that at this time last year. The new application, Cal State Applied, is good for students on the front end, but not so good for us on the back end. Student Affairs is confident we will have close to the same number of applications as last year as the kinks are worked out. We believe the Chancellor's Office just hasn't downloaded all our applications yet.

Student Affairs has hosted two mobile food pantries and served about 530 students at each event this fall. This exceeds our average last year of about 520 at each event. The need continues for food security for our campus.

Comment: Some students have reported that they received a message about the food pantries that said something to the effect of, "Don't be ashamed to be hungry, come to the food pantry" or words to that effect. They were insulted by this.
Response: The VPSA thanked the Senate for this information and will look at the language that is being used. This was not the intent of the message and she has not saw this language, but will address the issue.

Comment: It would be helpful to have the number to call for an emergency be visible across the campus so that it is easy to remember and to find when needed.
Response: This was brought up at a cabinet meeting and the VPSA will be working with the VPAF to see how they can do a better job of getting this and the app out to students.

**F. Chief Diversity Officer (CDO):**
The CDO noted that there are blue lights installed on each floor of the residence halls as well.

We are about 1/4th of the way through our intergroup facilitator dialogue training and one of our very own, Senator Shannon Rose Riley, is in that group. Twenty-three people are enrolled. It is mostly faculty, staff, and a few students. The training is four full days on Fridays and in the spring they will serve as intergroup dialogue facilitators.

The CDO works with the Faculty Diversity Committee and they worked together to host "Unconscious Bias" training for search committee members.

The CDO just completed the last training in conjunction with Faculty Affairs for search committees. The CDO is also working with individual search committee members in coming up with questions and ways to diversify their pools.

The CDO is in the process of collecting applications for RSCA awards. The major requirement is that the activity have something to do with closing the achievement gap for underrepresented students so that includes African-American, Latino/Latina, Native American as well as Asian and Pacific Islander students. Last year they awarded 10 grants and they come in the form of either .20 release time, or $5,000 in research funds, or a $5,000 summer salary during a summer faculty don't work.

**VIII. Special Committee Reports – No report.**

**IX. New Business – None**

**X. Adjournment –** The meeting adjourned at 4:07 p.m.

**Executive Committee Minutes**
**October 16, 2017**
**Noon – 1:30 p.m., ADM 167**

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

Absent: Riley, Willey

1. The minutes of October 2, 2017 were approved.

2. There was no dissent to the consent calendar of October 16, 2017.

3. Updates from the Administration:

   a. From the President:

      The President has been focused on the fires and helping our colleagues and students in the North Bay. Our faculty, staff, and students have been very supportive in offers of help. The President gave a shout-out to our former Dean of Humanities and the Arts, Dr. Lisa Vollendorf, who is now the Provost at Sonoma State. Dr. Vollendorf has been working very hard to find housing and provide emergency support for her campus despite being in danger of evacuation from her home. The latest news is that the fires may be contained by Friday. Sonoma State plans to open on Wednesday. Over 300 people lost their homes including the President of Sonoma State, Dr. Judy Sakaki.

      The Vice President of Student Affairs search will begin soon. The President's Office will be sending out a call for nominations for members for the search committee.

      The Wang Award announcement will go out soon.

      Work is being done on a national level on Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA).

   b. From the Provost:

      In order to diversify committees and add diversity of thought as well, the Provost is adding one additional faculty member to the search committees for the Dean of the College of Science and the Dean of the College of Education, which is in accordance with the new Search and Review of Administrators University Policy, S16-8.

The Provost recently returned from a 3-day event at the Chancellor's Office where they focused on the Graduation Initiative. There was also a meeting of all the VPs from Academic Affairs and Student Affairs to discuss ways they could work together more collaboratively.

c. From the Chief Diversity Officer (CDO):
Diversity refresher meetings have been held recently for faculty search committees.

Fast facts to market the campus have been posted on the CDO's website.

There will be anti-bias training for athletes this coming Wednesday (October 18, 2017).

The CDO is working on a strategic plan for her office.

The CDO is looking into free speech education seminars for the campus.

d. From the Vice President of Administration and Finance (VPAF):
The VPAF has been looking at the Spartan Shops Operation and possible outsourcing of the food and beverage operations.

e. From Associated Students (AS):
Students are still expressing concern about Professor Aptekar's case.

AS is considering establishing a Student Health Advisory Committee.

AS is accepting Student Trustee applications.

f. From the CSU Statewide Senate:
An informal event is being planned in honor of Professor Sabalius, the new Faculty Trustee from SJSU.

4. The Organization and Government Committee is in the process of reviewing policies related to lottery funds, and the possibility of giving some of the functions that used to be under the Lottery Committee to the Budget Advisory Committee. Discussion in the Executive Committee included historical information regarding oversight and distribution of funds then turned to the more current use of lottery funds to support library acquisitions. There is a sense that faculty have lost control over the decisions regarding the lottery funds.

An important question is whether or not these funds are supplanting general fund support of the library. The President will look into this. The Provost noted restructured library funding this year to support library acquisitions.

5. The committee reviewed a Sense of the Senate Resolution presented by Chair Frazier on Executive Orders 1100 and 1110. Chair Frazier presented an amendment to add a new first Whereas clause to read, “Whereas, many of the principles contained in Executive Orders 1100 (Revised) and 1110 are sound and welcome (for example, the principle of providing additional academic development for those frosh in need of it, in order for them to succeed better and in a more timely fashion); and.” The amendment passed (9-0-4).

   Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to remove the first Whereas and Resolved clauses. Senator Shifflett withdrew her amendment.

   Senator Peter presented an amendment to replace, “the content” on the second line of the first Resolved clause with, “elements of the content.” The amendment passed, 9-0-4.

   Senator Mathur presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to remove “various” in the third line of the second Resolved clause.

   The committee voted and the resolution passed as amended (9-0-4).

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

These minutes were transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on October 24, 2017. The minutes were reviewed and edited by the Senate Chair, Stefan Frazier, on October 24, 2017. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on October 30, 2017.

**Executive Committee Minutes**
**October 30, 2017**
**Noon – 1:30 p.m., ADM 167**

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

Absent: None

1. The minutes of October 16, 2017 were approved.

2. There was no consent calendar, but the Organization and Government Committee and the Curriculum and Research Committee both need a faculty representative to take the Education seats. The seats have gone at large, so they can be filled by a faculty member from any college.

3. Committee updates:

   a. From the Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
      C&R is working on referrals regarding R, S, and V requirements and borrowing faculty across departments.

      C&R is also continuing work on a curriculum policy.

   b. From the Professional Standards Committee (PS):
      PS is working on the Chair amendment to S15-7, Retention, Tenure, Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees policy recommendation. It will come to the Senate for a final reading on Monday, November 20, 2017.

      The President and Chair of the PS Committee are working on a resolution to the concerns the President expressed about the Chairs and Directors Policy.

      PS is working on a referral regarding the charge and possible membership changes to the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR). A few suggestions include allowing emeritus faculty and former senate chairs to serve as well as removing the election by college requirement.

      PS is also working on creating a policy for program directors. Program directors can be involved in hiring lecturers and advising students. Currently, there is no policy requiring the announcement of vacant director

positions, and/or the hiring and evaluation of directors. Program directors are also not appointed for specific terms.

c. From the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
I&SA is working on the Priority Registration Policy. There is some concern that the Student Success Committee is continuing to do reviews of priority registration even with their most recent change in charge and membership.

d. From the Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
O&G will likely hold off on bringing the AVP changes to the bylaw and constitution policy recommendations back to the Senate for final readings until they work on a referral they have to consider adding staff to the Senate.

O&G is considering two options related to review of lottery funds. One is to reestablish the Lottery Committee another is to place responsibilities with the Budget Advisory Committee. The original lottery committee was disbanded and the lottery function was initially given to the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC). Eventually, that function was transferred to the Strategic Planning Board. The Executive Committee discussed whether lottery funds are being used as required by law. There is concern that using these funds to support library acquisitions year-after-year is supplanting regular operating expenses for the library. Lottery funds used to be awarded by the Lottery Committee after reviewing applications across the university for various projects.

4. From the President:

There will be a discussion on the Master Plan on Wednesday, November 1, 2017 in the Theatre at 9:30 a.m.

The President feels the CSU has had success working with the legislature this year.

Questions:

Q: Can you give us an update on BART?

A: The issue comes down to whether they use single or double bore. If they use single bore then they can go with the West option. We wanted the East option. BART just said they won't operate single bore. Double bore is invasive and would

disrupt the downtown area for a long time. VTA has met with BART but a decision has been postponed until January.

Q: Can you speak to issues with the advanced degrees required in the health sciences?

A: The UCs have said they do not want to offer the advanced degrees being required by some of the health services. It started with Audiology and now includes Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy. If the CSU is going to offer these then the President will continue to advocate for more funding. There are additional issues to consider such as getting the right ratio of tenure/tenure-track faculty and professionals to teach the classes as well as equipment and lab needs. The President is not optimistic about the funding but will continue to push for it as we have a robust healthcare environment in Silicon Valley.

Q: Regarding the Master Plan discussions, they were very informative the last time. Having it on campus is very good news. Wouldn't this be the perfect time to bring up the issue of funding for the health services degrees if UC won't offer and we will?

A: Yes, we are all over the map in terms of the profiles of our students.

Q: Will there be opportunities to hear the Master Plan discussions on line? The CSU Statewide Senators will be gone to Long Beach on that date.

A: The President will check on this.

Q: Are there discussions between the CSU and UC over who will handle what clinical degrees?

A: Yes, primarily at the Chancellor level where they are discussing the increased certification needs of certain professions.

5. The President is rethinking commencement. Right now only 20% of graduating students participate. Due to the renovation efforts on South Campus being escalated as a result of increased donations, there will not be sufficient parking available for the spring commencement. The President wants this to be a quality experience for students where they can walk across the stage and get their diploma, shake hands, etc. However, a college or department cannot confer a degree. Only the university can confer degrees. Also, no one likes the fact that commencement is held over Memorial Day weekend, and the President does not want department ceremonies to be held during finals week. Thus, the President would like to hold college-level commencement ceremonies over the course of two days. The Event Center and Avaya Stadium are being considered. Department ceremonies would be held immediately following the bigger commencements.

   Committee members expressed concern that the departments were being told they can no longer hold their own department ceremonies. In some departments, student groups organize the department graduation events and they are making plans to move these events off campus. Students want to be able to see and interact with

the faculty in their departments. They do not understand why something they love is being taken away from them. In Political Science, for example, they give out medallions and then send students to commencement on Memorial Day weekend. The President responded that it was never the intention to prohibit departments from hosting their own events. However, what exactly is the intent and meaning of the department ceremonies?

Some members also expressed concern that due to the size of their own department events, it might not be feasible to do one college event time-wise.
Some departments also have issues with the timing of commencement. Their students are told to attend commencement, but some still have a 6-month internship to finish before officially graduating. They really need a December commencement, but many won't come back after their internship off campus.

Due to the number of graduates from some of the departments, department events can take over 2 hours. These departments are concerned that having one college-wide commencement for all is not feasible. The President feels that with the right planning and execution it can work.

6. The meeting adjourned at 1:34 p.m.

These minutes were transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on October 30, 2017. The minutes were reviewed and edited by the Senate Chair, Stefan Frazier, on November 2, 2017. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on November 13, 2017.

**Consent Calendar** 20-Nov-17

| Committee | Last Name/First Name | Term | Phone | Seat/College |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **ADD:** | | | | |
| ADAPC | Miranda, Celinda | EXO | | Seat J |
| ADAPC | Cutler, Chris | 2018 | chriscutler@ymail.com | Seat 4 |
| ADAPC | Thomas-Williams, Ashley | 2018 | ashley.thomas-williams@sjsu.edu | Seat 3 |
| Sustainability Board | Cloherty, Bethany | 2018 | bethanycloherty@gmail.com | Seat Q |
| | | | | |
| **REMOVE:** | | | | |
| ADAPC | Preston, Stephanie | EXO | | Seat J |

SAN JOSÉ STATE
UNIVERSITY

**Academic Senate Office**
ADM 176, 0024

# GENERAL ELECTIONS

2018 Calendar

| Timeline | Election Events |
|---|---|
| Friday, February 2 | Cover letter with instructions and petitions sent to all faculty. Petitions on line/attached. |
| Friday, February 23 | Nominating petitions due in Senate Office (ADM 176). |
| Monday - Friday<br>February 26 – March 2 | Verification of petitions and preparation of online ballots. |
| Monday, March 5 | Ballots online and info sent to faculty via college deans or directly or via college deans' offices electronically. |
| Friday, March 16 | Online voting deadline 5 p.m. |
| Monday - Friday<br>March 19 – March 23 | CoC Representatives verify appointment times for faculty that voted with College Deans' Offices. |
| Monday – Tuesday<br>April 2 – 3 | Final ballot count by the Senate AVC and Senate Administrator. |
| Monday, April 9 | Results reported to Academic Senate. |

Approved: November 8, 2017
Committee on Committees

Approved: November 13, 2017
Executive Committee

Approved: _____
Academic Senate

**SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY**
**Academic Senate**
**Professional Standards Committee**
**November 20, 2017** **AS 1646**
**Final Reading**

# POLICY RECOMMENDATION SELECTION AND REVIEW OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRS AND DIRECTORS

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

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

*This revision began with a referral from Organization and Government regarding the consolidation of voting procedures for Chairs that became necessary as the Department Voting Rights policy was revised. Next, a version was vetted before UCCD last year which actively participated in crafting some of the changes. We additionally received two rounds of suggestions and amendments from the Deans—most of which were accepted and incorporated. This revision appeared for a first reading on March 13, 2017 and for a final reading on April 10, 2017, but was pulled from the April 10 meeting to allow time for additional consultation with the Provost. The Provost appeared before Professional Standards on September 25 and relayed two concerns. The committee has responded to both concerns and it is our understanding that the policy language is now considered acceptable.*

*Approved: (November 6, 2017)*

*Vote: (10-0-0)*

*Present: (Chin, He, Marachi, Hamedi-Hagh, Kauppila, McKee, White, Peter, Donahue, Kimbarow)*

*Absent: (none)*

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

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

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

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. Preamble

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

### 1.2. Definitions

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

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

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

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

## 2. QUALIFICATIONS

Chairs should preferably be Professors but may be Associates, and should have earned rank and tenure prior to the time the appointment to Chair would become effective. Exceptions should only be made in rare instances and for compelling reasons.

## 3. DEPARTMENT NOMINATING PROCESS

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

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

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

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

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

3.5. Open meeting. A meeting shall be held to begin the election of a nominee to serve as Department Chair. The department may determine the nature and medium of the meeting according to its own preferences,

but the meeting must be open to all faculty in the department and publicized a minimum of one week in advance.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.10. Forwarding the results of the nominating election. Only the name of a candidate who receives a majority of votes cast by the tenured and probationary faculty shall be recommended to the President via the College Dean as the nominee of the department.[1] The names of candidates who were not recommended by the department, together with all vote totals, shall also be forwarded to the President to provide context for the recommendation. This shall include a statement of the vote of all faculty, broken down into two categories – vote by tenured/tenure track

[1] See CFA/CSU Agreement 20.30.

faculty and by lecturers -- including the actual number of votes cast in each category. If the final vote total from part-time faculty contains a fraction, it shall be rounded to help preserve anonymity.

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

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

## 4. EXTERNAL SEARCHES

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. APPOINTMENT

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

5.2. When a department follows the procedures of this policy to successfully elect a Chair Nominee, the President shall -- except in rare instances and for compelling reasons—appoint that individual to serve as Department Chair.

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

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

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

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

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

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

6.4. Extended interim Chairs. The extension of an interim appointment beyond one year should be avoided if possible. If this occurs the Organization and Government Committee of the Academic Senate shall inquire into the reasons for the situation.

## 7. REVIEW OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

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

7.2. Early Review: Department faculty may initiate a formal review of the Department Chair by submitting a petition to the Dean, provided that at least one academic year has passed since the Chair's appointment or previous review. The petition shall state simply that "The undersigned faculty call for a prompt review of our Department Chair." If the petition is signed by department faculty totaling more than 50% of the department electorate, the College Dean will initiate a formal review of the Department Chair. The petition should preferably be delivered early enough to permit the review to be completed before the end of the

current semester, but an early review should always be completed within 40 duty days from receipt of the petition. To determine if the petition exceeds the 50% threshold, the signatures of both tenure/tenure track faculty and lecturers will be counted, with the signatures of lecturers weighted according to the proportion of their appointment. The Dean will announce the number of signatures and whether the petition exceeds the threshold, but will keep the petition itself and the signed names confidential from the incumbent chair.

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

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

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

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

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

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

[2] See CFA/CSU Agreement Article 15

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

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

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

## 8. REAPPOINTMENT OF A DEPARTMENT CHAIR

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

## 9. SELECTION OF AN INTERIM CHAIR

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

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

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

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

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

## 10. SELECTION OF AN ACTING CHAIR

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

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

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

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

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

## 11. REMOVAL OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR

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

11.1. Administrative removal. The administrative removal of a Chair previously recommended by the faculty of a department is a very serious matter, and should only be undertaken for compelling reasons. A Chair will be given an opportunity to meet with the Provost and Dean to defend his/her record prior to removal. Following removal, the President or Provost should meet with the Dean and the faculty assembled in a department meeting to announce the action and solicit advice on the transition. Replacement of the Chair should be initiated according to the procedures in sections 3 or 9 of this policy.

11.2. Faculty initiated removal. Faculty may not initiate the removal of their Chair unless a formal review has been completed within the previous

six months. (They may initiate such a review as per 7.2 of this policy.) Following the conclusion of any faculty-initiated early review, the department will vote to determine if their Chair should be recalled. A recall vote will follow the same procedures as a vote to recommend a Chair nominee as described in section 3 of this policy, save only that it requires a vote of 2/3 of the tenure/tenure track faculty to forward a recommendation to the President that the Chair be removed, with the votes of lecturers also reported as per the above procedures. If removed, replacement of the Chair should be initiated according to the procedures in sections 3 or 9 of this policy.

**San Jose State University**
**Academic Senate**
**Instruction & Student Affairs Committee** **AS 1649**
**November 20, 2017**
**First Reading**

# Policy Recommendation
# Registration Priority

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

Whereas Senate Bill 412 prompted review of the student priority registration categories defined in F14-1 to accommodate California Promise;

Whereas it is the intention that priority registration also be reserved for students whose extracurricular duties, as defined below, could interfere with their enrollment opportunities; and,

Whereas it is the intention to clarify approval and oversight of student organizations receiving priority registration, in part due to S17-4 which redefines the Student Success Committee's membership and charge.

Resolved:

1.0 **Scheduling of Registration**

Students shall be allowed to register in the following order:

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

Students in Groups 2-7 will register on the basis of rotating alphabetical cycles within each group.

**Commented [L1]:** All undergraduate groups classified by grade level split into a and b to accommodate CA Promise students.

Consistent with what was proposed in Spring 2017.

Note: First-time freshman registration is based on orientation. Incoming-transfer students have a registration date dependent on when they matriculate and/or attend orientation.

## 2.0 Categories of Group 1: Specific Priority Students

### 2.1 Category A includes:

- Students who are required by external agencies such as the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), or by law, to receive priority. This excludes students covered by the California Promise program unless they also fall under another group with required priority registration. Priority registration for students in the California Promise program is addressed in the regular registration scheduling as outlined in Section 1.0.

- Students whose contributions through university sanctioned activities are recognized as being so extensive that their enrollment opportunities may be compromised due to schedules mandated by the sponsoring organization. These activities must meet the following criteria:
  - The sponsoring organization is acknowledged as significantly promoting the mission of the University;
  - The activity has a regularly scheduled class, event, or practice offered only at specific times that conflict with prime time classes that are offered and cannot be moved outside of prime time;
  - Participation at every class, event, or practice is mandatory; mandatory meetings must be set prior to the first day of the semester.
  - The sponsoring organization must apply for priority registration, establish a minimum GPA and process-to-degree criteria, and monitor students' progress each semester.

    2.1.1 Some groups in this category do not require regular review due to the nature of the organization. A review may be requested if/when circumstances change. Organizations in this category that do not require regular review/renewal include:
    - Accessible Education Center (AEC) students
    - AEC note takers
    - Associated Students Board of Directors
    - Student Fairness Committee
    - NCAA Athletics
    - Guardian Scholars
    - Reciprocal Exchange students

**Commented [L2]:** Section 2.0 Extensively rewritten to ensure clarity on groups receiving priority from a) activities or b) special GE coursework sequences.

Previous policy lacked sufficient clarity on the differentiation between categories.

**Commented [L3]:** Combined previous categories A and B. These categories were both related to activities/organization affiliation, but it wasn't sufficiently clear what the distinction between the categories was. The categories were combined, but made distinction between groups who required regular review and those who do not.

- Veterans (as per Cal. Educ. Code §66025.8)
- Students serving on Academic Senate committees that require student participation in order to perform essential functions
- Students who are part of any group that has a contractual agreement with SJSU to provide a full course load

2.2 Category B includes:

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

- Covers at least four areas of the General Education Program
- Involves being part of a cohort group of students from multiple colleges
- Requires enrollment together in a specified course sequence over multiple semesters.

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

## 3.0 Approval and Management of Priority Registration for Student Organizations

3.1 The Office for Student and Faculty Success (SFS) will review and approve applications from student organizations seeking priority registration. Approval will typically be granted for five years. The Office for Student and Faculty Success will be required to provide justification for denial or for approval of shorter terms.

3.2 The Office for Student and Faculty Success and the Registrar's Office will maintain records of student organizations with priority registration, including:

- Contact information for the faculty/staff member responsible for overseeing the organization's roster and student progress
- Approved estimated number of students receiving priority registration for each group
- Historical data on the number of students who actually received priority registration through the organization each semester

3.3 All student organization coordinators who apply for priority registration are responsible for:

- Maintaining an accurate roster of students eligible for priority registration and providing names and SJSU ID numbers to the Registrar by the required deadline for granting priority registration.
- Reporting changes in the organization duties/mission that may affect eligibility for priority registration and/or the number of students eligible for priority registration through the organization to the Office of Student and Faculty Success.

**Commented [L4]:** Section significantly rewritten because in the previous policy Sections 3.0 and 4.0 lacked clarity on oversight and tracking of priority registration. Sections combined to clarify oversight and streamline record keeping.

- Applying/Renewing priority registration no less than one semester prior to the desired start/expiration of the organization's priority registration.

**Rationale:**
Senate Bill 412, passed on September 21, 2016, defines the California Promise program and legislates the requirement of priority registration for California Promise students. This program is available to freshman and to transfer students with an associate degree for transfer. It facilitates four-year graduation for freshman and two-year graduation for transfer students with commitments on the part of the university and the student. One such commitment on the university side is priority registration. This policy integrates the priority registration for students in the California Promise program into the registration for all students by class level in order to balance the requirement to give priority registration to students in the California Promise program with the need to maintain access to classes for all students.
Approved:
Vote:
Present:
Financial impact: None

Workload impact: Initial work will be needed by enrollment services to adapt the registration process to account for students in the California Promise program. Work will be required by the Office of Student and Faculty Success and the Registrar's Office to review student organization applications, maintain records, and ensure the list of students enrolled in the California Promise program are accurate.

San José State University
Academic Senate
Organization and Government Committee AS 1656
November 20, 2017
First Reading

# Policy Recommendation
# Modification of Bylaw 1.10 Pertaining to Academic Deans

Legislative History: This proposal would Modify bylaw 1.10 which pertained to the definition of the term 'academic dean'.

Whereas: Administrative changes and reporting lines have changed in the academic affairs division with the appointment of a deputy provost, and

Whereas: The language in bylaw 1.10 presently conveys that AVPs report directly to the provost, which is no longer the case, therefore be it

Resolved That bylaw 1.10 be modified as follows:

1.10 ~~The phrase "academic deans" as used in~~ With regard to Article II, Section 2 of the constitution, ~~means~~ college deans within Academic Affairs will select their two representatives for staggered two-year terms; ~~and~~ Associate Vice Presidents within Academic Affairs will select their representatives for a two-year term; ~~reporting directly to the Provost.~~ and one Associate Vice President from a division outside of Academic Affairs will be selected by the President in consultation with the Senate Executive Committee for a two-year term. ~~Elections of representative deans shall be conducted and reported by~~ The Provost will report the selection of representative Deans and Associate Vice Presidents from Academic Affairs to the Senate Chair. The President will report the selection of the AVP representative from the division outside Academic Affairs to the Senate Chair. ~~and~~ Any vacancies arising before the end of a term shall be filled for the balance of that term by selection as outlined above. ~~special elections~~

Rationale: In conjunction with changes to the constitution being considered concurrently with this bylaw change, the bylaw now appropriately focuses on process. *For the AVP representative outside of academic affairs, the selection process is intended to meet the needs of the Academic Senate in any given year. It therefore involves both faculty and administrators to facilitate discussions related to the needs of the Senate in the context of University initiatives, challenges, and priorities.*

Approved: 11/6/17
Vote: 10-0-0
Present: Curry, Grosvenor, Hart, Higgins, Rajkovic, Shifflett, Ormsbee, Ramasubramanian, Tran, Rangasayee
Absent: Bailey
Financial Impact: None
Workload Impact: None

**SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY**
**Academic Senate**
**Professional Standards Committee**
**November 20, 2017** **AS 1666**
**Final Reading**

# POLICY RECOMMENDATION Amendment F to University Policy S15-7 Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Procedures Regarding Department Chair Participation on RTP Committees

Resolved: That S15-7 be amended as shown in the strikeout and underline of the following excerpt from the policy.

*Rationale:* *This amendment is provoked by several issues that have been brought to the attention of the Professional Standards Committee during the transition to the new RTP policies. These amendments relate to a clause in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) about the participation of Department Chairs on department RTP committees. For reference, that clause reads as follows:*

> *15.40 b.* Department chairs may make separate recommendations. Such recommendations shall be forwarded to subsequent levels of review. If the chair makes a separate recommendation, s/he shall not participate as a member of the peer committee. (CBA, 2014-2017)

*First, the 1998 RTP policy was silent about who would chair a department RTP committee, leaving the matter to the discretion of the Committee. S15-7 designated that the Department Chair would chair the committee if serving as a member. In practice this is often the most convenient arrangement, since Chairs are generally responsible for supervising the process at the department level. However, it was brought to our attention that certain large departments prefer to elect chairs of their RTP committees other than their Department Chair—in part to spread workload—in part to allow faculty who may be more senior and experienced to hold the job. Furthermore, this is particularly important in departments that have Associates as Chair of the Department.*

*Second, there has been ambiguity about whether Chairs MUST serve on an RTP committee if elected to it—thus forfeiting their right under the CBA to write a separate Chair's evaluation. This amendment removes that ambiguity by making it clear that the Chair may decline to serve on the committee. We believe this comports more closely with the CBA.*

*Third, the old policy required Department Chairs who were not serving on the committee to write a separate recommendation. The CBA says they "may." We bring the university policy into conformity with the CBA by using the word "may."*

*Approved: Under Review by the Committee*

*Vote: (8-0-1)*

*Present: (Chin, He, Marachi, Hamedi-Hagh, Kauppila, McKee, White, Peter, Donahue)*

*Absent: (Kimbarow)*

*Financial Impact: No direct impacts.*

*Workload Impact: No direct impacts except to shift workload from some Department Chairs to other faculty.*

# POLICY
# RECOMMENDATION
# Amending
# S15-7, University Policy, Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Procedures

……..

3.2.10 Department Chair participation. A Department Chair is eligible to serve on the department committee, and if elected to the committee the Chair of the Department shall ~~serve as Chair of the committee and shall~~ not write a separate Chair's recommendation. If the Chair is not elected to the department committee or if the Chair declines to serve on the committee then the Chair may ~~shall~~ write a separate recommendation. The Chair of the Department may participate in either capacity only if he/she is of sufficient academic rank as per 3.2.5. Such recommendations shall be forwarded to the college level along with the recommendations of the department committee and any responses to the departmental level recommendation(s) supplied by the faculty member.

……

San José State University
Academic Senate
Organization and Government Committee AS 1669
November 20, 2017
First Reading

# Policy Recommendation
# Amendment to Senate Constitution Regarding Administrative Representatives

Legislative History: This proposal, if subsequently approved by the full faculty, would modify the Senate's constitution related to administrative representatives to the Senate so that an AVP from outside the academic affairs division would be selected by the President in consultation with the Senate's Executive Committee. This proposal also clarifies representation from the academic affairs division from among Deans and AVPs.

Whereas: SJSU's challenges, initiatives, and strategic goals evolve over time, and

Whereas: Clarification is needed regarding administrative representatives from the academic affairs division, and

Whereas: Interest has been expressed in a wider representation of administrators on the Academic Senate, therefore be it

Resolved That Article II, section 2 of the Senate Constitution pertaining to administrative representatives be amended as follows:

ARTICLE II -- MEMBERSHIP

Section 2. Administration representatives shall consist of the President, the Provost, the Vice President for Administration and Finance, the Vice President for Student Affairs, and the Chief Diversity Officer, ex officio; ~~and four (4) academic~~ <u>two college deans</u> from academic affairs inclusive of CIES and the library; <u>*two* Associate Vice President from Academic Affairs; and one Associate Vice President from a division outside academic affairs.</u> ~~at least two of whom shall be deans of colleges, elected by the academic deans for staggered two-year terms.~~

Rationale: This modification allows for the selection of administrators to the Senate whose expertise would be particularly valuable in any given year in the context of the University's changing needs over time. *Historically, substantive benefits to the Senate have been realized due to the fact that our Senate is an Academic Senate inclusive of administrative representatives who can be engaged in discussions at the starting point regarding the formulation of university policy proposals. The particular designation of representatives in our constitution highlights the Senate's need for collaboration with*

*administrators engaged in a wide range of leadership responsibilities from visionary planning to concrete implementation responsibilities across divisions.*

The change also clarifies representation from among the Deans and AVPs in a way that does not require further definition in Senate bylaws. In conjunction with changes being considered to bylaw 1.10, the change keeps this section of the constitution focused on membership and places process in the bylaws.

| | |
|---|---|
| Approved: | 11/6/17 |
| Vote: | 10-0-0 |
| Present: | Curry, Grosvenor, Hart, Higgins, Rajkovic, Rangasayee , Shifflett, Tran, Ramasubramanian, Ormsbee |
| Absent: | Bailey |
| Financial Impact: | None |
| Workload Impact: | None |

San José State University
Academic Senate
Organization and Government Committee AS 1670
November 20, 2017
Final Reading

# Senate Management Resolution
## Rescind SM-S96-6: Lottery Funds Committee
## Rescind SM-S01-1: Creating a Temporary External Relations Task Force
## Rescind SM-F08-3: Membership of the Graduate Studies and Research Committee

Legislative History

**SM-S96-6**: This proposal, seeks to rescind a policy that is no longer relevant given subsequent policy updates. SM-S96-6 established the charge and membership of a lottery funds committee. The committee was abolished by S01-9 but not removed from the list of active senate management resolutions.
**SM-S01-1**: This proposal rescinds SM-S01-1 which pertained to an External Relations Task Force.
**SM-F08-3**: This proposal rescinds SM-F08-3 which pertained to the membership of the Graduate Studies and Research Committee. Previously SM-F15-4 clarified the membership of this committee through amendment of SM-S96-5.

Whereas: It is important for the records residing on the website to be current, and

Whereas: The lottery funds committee, which was established by SM-S96-6, was abolished by S01-9, and

Whereas: SM-S01-1 established an external relations task force which no longer exists, and

Whereas: The activities envisioned for an external relations group are now more fully coordinated at both the ASCSU level and here at SJSU, and

Whereas: SM-F15-4 (Modification of the Graduate Studies and Research Committee) amended SM-S96-5 which established the membership for the Studies and Research Committee but overlooked the need to rescind SM-F08-3, therefore be it

Resolved That SM-S96-6 (Lottery Funds Committee), SM-S01-1 (External Relations Task Force), and SM-F08-3 (Changing the Membership of the Graduate Studies and Research Committee) be rescinded.

Rationale:
**SM-S96-6**: While disposition of the charge of the original lottery funds committee and oversight of the allocation of lottery funds remain open questions, this recommendation simply seeks to officially rescind SM-S96-6.
**SM-S01-1:** The plan was for an external relations group to "issue a report to the Organizational & Government Committee that describes the Task Force's activities and membership for the year and makes recommendations regarding the continuance of the Task Force. O & G will use this information to determine whether and how the activities of the Task Force should be made part of the Senate structure. The Task Force shall continue its work until further action by O&G or the Senate Executive Committee." No report could be located and no action was taken. In addition, the task force does not presently exist. Therefore, rescinding SM-S01-1 is a logical part of the 'clean up' of our records.
**SM-F08-3:** Rescinding this item corrects an oversight when SM-F15-4 was developed. Since SM-F15-4 has clarified the membership of the Graduate Studies and Research Committee, the previous senate management resolution related to this committee's membership needs to be rescinded.

| | |
|---|---|
| Approved: | 10/30/17 |
| Vote: | 11-0-0 |
| Present: | Bailey, Curry, Grosvenor, Hart, Higgins, Ormsbee, Rajkovic, Ramasubramanian, Rangasayee, Shifflett, Tran |
| Absent: | None |
| Financial Impact: | None |
| Workload Impact: | None |

San José State University
Academic Senate
Organization and Government Committee AS 1671
November 20, 2017
First Reading

# Senate Management Resolution
# Addition to the Responsibilities of the Budget Advisory Committee Related to Lottery Funds

Legislative History: This proposal seeks to place responsibility for review, oversight, and advice regarding the disposition of lottery funds with the Budget Advisory Committee. S01-9 abolished the lottery funds committee and re-assigned the group's responsibilities.

Whereas: S01-9 abolished the lottery committee and directed that "the general categories of lottery funds dispersal reside with and be determined each Academic Year by the Senate Budget Advisory Committee and recommended to the President", and

Whereas: Over time, the charge and responsibilities of a Budget Advisory Committee have been less than clear and at times redirected to other groups (e.g., Senate Executive Committee), and

Whereas: F15-9 re-instituted a Budget Advisory Committee and noted that the group would provide "input and recommendations to the President throughout the planning, implementation and subsequent review of budget expenditures including advice on key campus priorities." and

Whereas: Lottery funds in the recent past have been used to address budget shortfalls (e.g., library acquisitions); oversight from a university-wide committee would be better able to address needs through review across divisions regarding the allocation of funds, therefore, be it

Resolved That the responsibilities of the budget advisory committee be modified as follows:

Modify 1.3.9 to read: Review, analyze, and advise the President regarding significant budget actions external to the campus that could impact the University ~~'s Operating Fund~~; e.g., lottery funds, the initial CSU budget proposal, and the Governor's May Revise.

Add a section 1.3.9.1: The committee should review and make recommendations regarding the use of lottery funds and include this information in its annual summary report to the Senate.

Rationale: After the lottery funds committee was discontinued (S01-9) responsibilities related to the allocation of these funds changed over time and eventually lost the engagement of a group to provide review and advice. S01-9 set the responsibility to determine each year and recommend to the President the categories for distribution of lottery funds along with the Senate's Budget Advisory Committee. At that time it appears that college-based lottery committees existed and that dispersal guidelines, oversight, and evaluation of specific lottery-funded programs would be their responsibility. Though not explicitly including reference to lottery funds, in S07-3 (the planning and budget process) or S09-6 (strategic planning) the broad responsibilities connected to the Resource Review Board (S07-3) included resource allocations. Later, the Strategic Planning Board (S09-6) was charged with serving as the budget advisory committee. The responsibilities of the Budget Advisory Committee subsequently were given to the Senate's Executive Committee (SM-S11-1).

At the time a new Budget Advisory Committee was established (F15-9) neither the charge or designation of responsibilities included work pertaining to lottery funds. Given the BAC's broad engagement in University-wide budget issues as well as it's connection to strategic planning, this is the group best able to take into consideration issues pertaining to the use of lottery funds.

| | |
|---|---|
| Approved: | 11/6/17 |
| Vote: | 10-0-0 |
| Present: | Curry, Grosvenor, Hart, Higgins, Ormsbee, Rajkovic, Rangasayee, Ramasubramanian, Shifflett, Tran |
| Absent: | Bailey |
| Financial Impact: | None |
| Workload Impact: | None |

San José State University
Academic Senate
University Library Board AS 1672
November 20, 2017
First Reading

# Policy Recommendation
# Amendment A to University Library Policy (S15-10)

Whereas: University library policy is drafted to support the curricular and research needs of the University; and

Whereas: Current literature[1] in the field of academic librarianship suggests that students are best served by a single reference desk, known as a Unified Service Point (USP), located near the entrance of the building; and

Whereas: Existing library policy specifies that University reference services be located on the second floor of King Library; and

Whereas: The Dean and Faculty of the University Library have determined that the best location for the USP is the first floor of King Library, therefore so be it

Resolved: That S15-10 Section 5.1 be amended to remove language specifying location of the reference desk, as follows:

> 5.1 General Faculty and Staff Support. The academic mission of the Library shall be advanced by specialized practices unique to a University or an academic library setting, whenever such practices are customary in libraries of institutions of higher education. Library faculty and staff will be enabled to carry out academically oriented functions and shall not merge unique academic functions and practices with the City Library. The City and University will share delivery of basic reference services through a common service area ~~on the second floor~~.

[1] Flanagan, Pat & Lisa R. Horowitz. "Exploring new service models: can consolidating public service points improve response to customer needs?." The Journal of Academic Librarianship 26, no. 5 (2000): 329-338.

Chauvet, Marianne, Vicki Bourbous, and Frances Liston. "Service matters: Single Service Point as a collaborative and professional learning initiative for service excellence." Journal of Access Services 13, no. 2 (2016): 80-90.

Mayo, Alexa, Everly Brown, and Ryan Harris. "Opportunities and Efficiencies in Building a New Service Desk Model." Medical Reference Services Quarterly 36, no. 3 (2017): 211-219.

| | |
|---|---|
| Approved: | 11/13/17 |
| Vote: | 7-0-1 |
| Present: | Cabrera, Megwalu, Tian, Taylor, Khavul, Sasikumar, Bodart, Lee |
| Absent: | Gayle, Smith, Kim, Manzo |
| Financial Impact: | None |
| Workload Impact: | None |