

**SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE**

**2016/2017**

**Agenda**

**November 21, 2016, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm**

**Engineering 285/287**

- I. **Call to Order and Roll Call**
- II. **Approval of Minutes:**  
**Senate Minutes of October 24, 2016**
- III. **Communications and Questions:**
  - A. From the Chair of the Senate
  - B. From the Chair of the ASCSU
  - C. From the President of the University
- IV. **Executive Committee Report:**
  - A. Minutes of the Executive Committee –  
**Executive Committee Minutes of October 17, 2016**  
**Executive Committee Minutes of October 31, 2016**
  - B. Consent Calendar –  
**Consent Calendar of November 21, 2016**  
**Election Calendar for 2017**
  - C. Executive Committee Action Items –  
***AS 1636, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Reaffirming San José State University’s Commitment to an Inclusive Campus Climate and our Determination to Provide a Safe, Supportive, and Welcoming Community (Final Reading)***
- V. **New Business:**
- VI. **Unfinished Business:**
- VII. **Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation)**
  - A. Organization and Government Committee (O&G)  
***AS 1621, Policy Recommendation, Departmental Voting Rights (First Reading)***  
  
***AS 1628, Policy Recommendation, Modification of Bylaw 15 Pertaining to Editorial Changes of Senate Documents (Final Reading)***  
  
***AS 1629, Policy Recommendation, Concurrent Membership on Operating and Policy Committees (Final Reading)***

***AS 1634, Constitutional Amendment, Modification of Senate Constitution Related to membership (Final Reading)***

***AS 1638, Policy Recommendation, Modification of Bylaw 2.2: Pertaining to the Term Length for Senate Chair (First Reading)***

***AS 1639, Policy Recommendation, Modification of Bylaw 4.1: Senate Executive Committee Membership (First Reading)***

***AS 1635, Amendment A to University Policy S16-8, Selection and Review of Administrators (Final Reading)***

B. University Library Board (ULB):

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

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

***AS 1637, Policy Recommendation, Required Enrollment for Culminating Graduate Students (First Reading)***

***AS 1640, Policy Recommendation, Final Examinations, Evaluations, or Culminating Activities Policy (First Reading)***

E. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

***AS 1632, Policy Recommendation: Amendment B to S15-6, Appointment of Regular Faculty Employees; Composition of Recruitment Committees (Final Reading)***

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

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

**IX. Special Committee Reports:**

**X. Adjournment:**

2016/2017 Academic Senate

MINUTES  
October 24, 2016

**I. The meeting was called to order at 2:02 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Forty-Nine Senators were present.**

**Ex Officio:**

Present: Kimbarow, Sabalius,  
Van Selst, Lee  
Absent: Pérea

**CASA Representatives:**

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

**Administrative Representatives:**

Present: Papazian, Faas, Blaylock  
Absent: Lanning, Feinstein

**COB Representatives:**

Present: Reade, Rodan, Campsey  
Absent: None

**Deans:**

Present: Green, Stacks, Jacobs,  
Schutten  
Absent: None

**EDUC Representatives:**

Present: Laker, Mathur  
Absent: None

**Students:**

Present: Caesar, Balal, Tran,  
Torres-Mendoza  
Absent: Spica, Medina

**ENGR Representatives:**

Present: Sullivan-Green, Chung, Hamed-Hagh  
Absent: None

**H&A Representatives:**

Present: Frazier, Grindstaff, Riley  
Ormsbee, Miller, Khan  
Absent: None

**Alumni Representative:**

Present: Walters  
Absent: None

**SCI Representatives:**

Present: Kaufman, White, Cargill, Boekema  
Absent: None

**Emeritus Representative:**

Present: Buzanski  
Absent: None

**SOS Representatives:**

Present: Peter, Wilson, Trulio, Curry, Hart  
Absent: None

**Honorary Representative:**

Present: Lessow-Hurley  
Absent: None

**General Unit Representatives:**

Present: Matoush, Higgins, Trousdale  
Absent: Kauppila

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

The minutes of September 26, 2016 were approved as written.

The minutes of October 10, 2016 were approved as amended by Senator Sabalius.

**III. Communications and Questions –**

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

Chair Kimbarow recently attended the Senate Chair’s meeting in Long Beach. The major topic was the pending tuition increase. The rest of the meeting was mostly administrative about what was going on at each campus.

**Announcements:**

Chair Kimbarow reminded Senators that the election was in two weeks and to consider voting yes on proposition 65. This is critical to the continued funding for the CSU.

Senators were invited to the annual holiday party at the President's home on December 4, 2016 from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m.

Senators were reminded to save the date for the Senate Retreat on Friday, January 27, 2017 from 8 a.m. to 3 p.m.

The annual Senate photo will be taken at the next Senate meeting on November 21, 2016 in this room.

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

President Papazian announced that she has been in active discussions about how to ensure the safety of students, faculty, and staff on and near our campus.

President Papazian is looking at the nature of the alerts that are given out to the campus. There are certain requirements that the campus has, but the key to sending out these alerts is “a clear and present danger.” The question is what if it isn’t a clear and present danger, or the incident happened in the past. One of the problems that we have is that when too many alerts are issued people stop reading them, and then when we actually have an alert people won’t read the emails. There may be other ways to communicate incidents that happen on campus. President Papazian will be working on developing a policy that makes sense.

President Papazian believes in being as transparent as possible even with the press about the issues and ongoing investigations on campus. It has been the President’s experience that when you let the press know that this is a privacy issue or an active investigation, they usually respect that.

President Papazian has been meeting with local legislators. She recently met with Congresswoman Zoe Lofgren who had not been on campus for some time. They talked about ways they might work together. Hopefully this will lead to some positive opportunities for the campus. President Papazian also met with Assemblyman Low and he is very interested in bringing policy changes that promote student success. President Papazian then met with Mayor Liccardo and they talked a little bit about the joint agreement with the city and SJSU regarding the MLK Library. About 90% of the incidents that occur in the library involve non-academic and non-university personnel. That is a challenge. However, we are committed to the partnership and so is the city. The city has introduced someone to work in the area of mental health with the library to help with the needs of the local homeless population and to link them up with resources in the area. Dean Elliott will be working and following up with her city counterpart on library issues.

President Papazian announced there were several wonderful events recently at the Hammer Theatre. The mayor and President Papazian hosted a reception there to kick off their partnership. There was also an extraordinary film at the Hammer Theatre last night that had to do with human trafficking.

President Papazian has also spent some time with the leadership of the Research Foundation. The Research Foundation supports our faculty, and our students. We need to find that true balance for our faculty between research and teaching mission. President Papazian is fully committed to the research mission, because in “our 21<sup>st</sup> Century environment, healthy and good teaching is informed by active and engaged scholarship as appropriate.”

Last night President Papazian was at the Hispanic Foundation Ball, which was actually an amazing event. This is an educational foundation that raises money to support our Hispanic students. They have a wonderful initiative now in the area of STEM where they are raising money for scholarships for students to come to universities in the area to pursue STEM careers. Many of the students come to SJSU. The President is in the process of identifying space in our library for undocumented students. Where they can come get the support they need.

President Papazian spent some time in Omaha to chair the C. Peter Magrath Community Engagement Scholarship Award Committee. The McGrath Award is the award that we won at SJSU last year for CommUniverCity San José. The President was very proud of the work that SJSU had done.

President Papazian has also been asked to be on the Board of HERS. This is a women’s leadership in higher education group. President Papazian is very committed to fostering leadership of all kinds, but especially women’s leadership. President Papazian has benefited greatly from the mentorship and generosity of many and feels this is a way to give back to the community.

President Papazian will be at the National Association of System Heads Workshop and will have to miss the next Senate meeting. This workshop will focus on how to support student success. The President will be highlighting our partnership between Academic and Student Affairs. How that was developed, and what the goals and processes are.

Finally, the President has been asked to serve on the search committee for the new CSU Vice Chancellor for Human Resources.

The Chancellor has launched a conversation with our students around the possibility of a tuition increase. The reality is that nobody wants a tuition increase, but at the same time mandatory costs go up. The shortfall between the Governor’s proposed budget and the budget we need to actually deliver the programs, including the graduation initiative, is about \$159 million.

President Papazian announced that Measure B is a transportation measure that would bring Bart to San Jose. SJSU is the largest footprint in the Bay area with 39,000 people, but we haven't been asked for our input on this. Now we are becoming part of the conversation, because President Papazian has been talking to everyone about it.

**Questions:**

**Q:** Some proposed tuition increases are intended as leverage on the Governor and legislators. Other tuition increases are planned in conjunction with the Governor and legislators, which kind of tuition increase is this one?

**A:** There is another avenue. What would suffer is the graduation initiative, because that needs funds. This means putting faculty in the classroom. From a quality of education point of view, there is no doubt that we need to be moving towards hiring more tenure/tenure-track faculty. However, the funding needs to be there, because you can't hire people with one-time money.

**IV. Executive Committee Report –**

**A. Executive Committee Minutes –**

EC Minutes of September 12, 2016 – no questions.

EC Minutes of October 3, 2016 – no questions.

**B. Consent Calendar –**

Consent Calendar of October 24, 2016 – approved (49-0-0).

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

**V. New Business – None**

**VI. Unfinished Business: None**

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

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

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

**C. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) – None.**

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

Senator Peter presented *AS 1632, Amendment B to University Policy S15-6, Appointment of Regular Faculty Employees; Composition of Recruitment Committees (First Reading)*. This came to PS as a referral from people interested in searching for interdisciplinary positions and wanted to know if there was a way to

staff a search committee with people from more than one department and in the existing policy there is no way to do this. This amendment makes it possible for the home department, if it chooses to do so, to elect members from other departments to round out a search committee. The home department would retain a majority of the members.

**Questions:**

Q: My question is in regards to section 3.2.4 and a search for a tenured position, has the committee considered allowing probationary faculty to participate in recruitment so that the department as a whole can work together on recruiting their new faculty member?

A: The committee has considered it and in fact there was a time when probationary faculty could not serve on a search committee at all, but now they can serve on a search committee for a faculty member of equal or lower rank. However, the committee has not considered allowing an assistant professor to serve on a search committee for an associate or full professor for the same reasons they don't serve on RTP committees. Maybe we should consider that. The concern was that an assistant professor should not be hiring someone that could be evaluating him/her.

Q: Would the committee consider building in some language around balance and diversity?

A: There is some general language, but the committee will look at this again.

Q: Can the committee please consider 3.2.4. We rarely hire people that are tenured in my department, and when we do they are usually hired into a chair position. Probationary faculty would have a great stake in this because this would be their immediate supervisor.

A: When it comes to hiring a Chair, the Chair's policy has a parallel process and all faculty in the department have a role in that. However, it is a separate role than in the RTP process.

---

Senator Peter presented *AS 1633, Policy Recommendation, Adopting New SOTE and SOLATE Instruments (Final Reading)*. Senator Peter presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change the effective date in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Resolved clause from "Spring 2016" to "as soon as possible." **The Senate voted and AS 1633 passed as amended** (39-0-2).

Note: The Senate discussed a difference in the free response questions between the SOTE and SOLATE. The SOTE and SOLATE cannot be amended on the Senate floor and must be amended by the Student Evaluation Review Board (SERB). Emily Slusser, Chair of SERB, explained this was a mistake.

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

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1626, Modification of Bylaw 6.13: Conversion of College Seats to at-large Seats (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1626 passed** (31-0-1).

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1628, Policy Recommendation, Modification of Bylaw 15 Pertaining to Editorial Changes of Senate Documents (Final Reading)*. Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change line 27 to read, “unanimous consent from, the Executive Committee and the President can correct the error(s).” Senator Van Selst presented a motion to return the resolution to committee. **The Senate voted and the Van Selst motion passed** (29-0-2).

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1621, Policy Recommendation, Departmental Voting Rights (First Reading)*. The information about voting rights currently can be found in multiple documents, particularly the voting rights and selection and review of department chairs policies. Both of these policies are currently under review. Since they are both under review, we need to keep the last resolved clause which starts on line 36. This allows us to keep one piece of the voting rights policy, while scrapping the rest. Lecturer votes related to department chair recommendations remain advisory until University Policy S14-8, Selection and Review of Department Chairs, is amended or rescinded by the Professional Standards Committee.

The O&G Committee went through multiple rounds of discussion on section 2.1 regarding whether there were times that voting should be required. The consensus was yes, and this is added to section 2.1.

In section 3.1, voting rights specific to curriculum would be restricted to regular faculty. Regular faculty are defined as our tenure and tenure/track faculty. Then in section 3.3, faculty on loan to another department can request departmental voting rights in that department and the regular faculty in that department can subsequently grant them voting rights in their department. This was important and the committee went back and forth about it and decided that the department should have a say in this. Section 3.6 clarifies that faculty suspended from their department retain their voting rights. O&G discussions regarding this section included feedback from Faculty Affairs. Article 17 and Article 19 of the CFA contract refer to several kinds of suspensions, however, all of them assume the faculty member is coming back after the suspension. You cannot deprive them of voting rights when they return from suspension.

In section 4, the language for temporary faculty parallels the language for permanent faculty. In section 5, O&G had a lengthy discussion. What was proposed is that faculty serving as chair outside their department have full voting rights in the department that they chair and retain voting rights in their home department.

O&G does understand that bylaw 1.7 will have to be amended if this policy passes at final reading.



**Questions:**

Q: In section 1.1.1, line 109, page 4, it reads, “Engagement in deliberations prior to voting should be the norm as it leads to more informed decision making.” However, 1.1.1 is referenced in sections 3.4, 3.5, and 5.2, and in section 3.4 it takes on a requirement and is no longer a recommendation, so what is the committee trying to accomplish—to broaden or restrict voting rights?

A: O&G struggled with sections 1.1.1 and 1.1.2. Section 3.4 is talking about leave, and if you are on leave you should be part of a deliberation before you vote.

Q: A person could vote and not be informed, and a person could be informed and sleep through the deliberations. Why is this struck in section 4.4?

A: If faculty are on partial leave they should still be there.

Q: In line 138, section 2.1.1.1, it talks about situations where departments form a special department curriculum committee and the deliberations that occur there, and faculty outside the department committee can ask that the decision be reviewed. My question is what was the deliberation around this and why is it necessary?

A: One of the examples we heard included a committee of two or three making a curriculum decision that goes straight to the college and faculty don’t have any input. The balance O&G came to was to say that the faculty member could request that the item be considered. O&G tried to find a middle ground that would not halt or slow down the business of the department.

Q: I understand it would be inappropriate for a faculty member to go to a chair and have the chair immediately forward that course to the college, but in this particular situation you are saying there has been a department curriculum committee and if that faculty member is concerned about curriculum then they should serve on that department curriculum committee.

A: Let me clarify. You said voted on by the faculty, in several cases the faculty are appointed to the department curriculum committee, and so that is another reason for having the opportunity to question things.

Q: Why would this then be only for curriculum, why not for scholarship department committees, etc.?

A: O&G got feedback that if you open this up to everything under the sun, nothing will get done. For curriculum issues, it was important to have checks and balances.

Q: For junior faculty serving on the department curriculum committee did O&G consider the potential repercussions for them when having discussions with tenured faculty that might be upset with the department curriculum decisions?

A: O&G saw no repercussions, but we will bring this back to the committee.

Q: I read ambiguity in the language in section 2.1. It is not clear to me whether this means every single regular faculty member has to vote in a given election, or an election must be held and all regular faculty members have a right to vote.

A: The point of this is that voting is required for these things.

Q: Then I think you need to say that all regular faculty members are required to vote.

A: All regular faculty are not required to vote, but voting is required.

Q: Would you agree there is ambiguity there? I think the committee should work on

this.

A: The committee will review the language.

Q: In line 158, section 3.2, this sounds like language appropriate for temporary faculty members, are there permanent faculty that aren't wholly within a department?

A: There are five of them. Faculty Affairs gave the committee some good data on this and 99.2% of faculty work in one department, but .8 % work in more than one department.

Q: On line 203, it states "excluding those relegated to regular faculty..." Can we say something like "entrusted to," or "designated for"?

A: Sure, the committee will consider it.

Q: On the matter of temporary faculty, notwithstanding the fact that there are probably good reasons to oppose allowing temporary faculty to vote on curriculum, and notwithstanding the fact that there have been situations on this campus where temporary faculty have outvoted the permanent faculty on curricular matters at times when the full-time faculty have been severely opposed to the curricular matter, but given the fact that there are other departments where temporary faculty don't do such things and do write curricula, propose courses, pass them and teach them, (for example, Senator Khan is a lecturer in our department and holds a doctorate) is there room to compromise such that individual departments could have the leeway to allow temporary faculty voting on committees on curriculum matters?

A: This is university policy and it applies to faculty across the university, so whatever comes out of it we cannot have a clause that says departments can say what the rights are of lecturers. However, the committee will consider it.

Q: Section 1.3 and 7.1.3 indicate that faculty only vote in meetings, for example let's take the example of the person that requests a vote on a curriculum matter, does that faculty member have to bring that up in a department meeting and then make the request faculty vote on the request to determine whether there should be a vote on the matter, or might there be room in the policy to allow some departments that hold votes outside of meetings, to have items voted on by faculty members in other places?

A: I believe that provision is already here because it does say that the regular faculty can decide on the process, and the process can vary from one type of decision made to another type of decision made and how you are going to do them. However, we will review the policy and make sure that is in there.

Q: Section 7.1.3 says formal voting shall only be conducted after a proposal has been discussed and those eligible to vote are those who participate in deliberations in person prior to the vote.

A: That only pertains to a formal vote, one where you are required to make a motion, have a second, have discussion, and then vote.

Q: So this policy doesn't regulate non-formal votes?

A: The committee will review this for clarity.

Q: There are several policies where voting is regulated such as in the Board of General Studies policy, etc. It would be great if this policy could list all voting policies in section 2.1.

A: The only two policies we found that were relevant were the RTP policy and the Selection and Review of Department Chairs policy, and we can give you policy numbers for those.

Q: In Section 7.1, should procedures be in place in departments, or may faculty change the voting procedures each time they vote?

A: When it comes up is how I read that.

Q: Can disruptive faculty tie the hands of the department because they may with every vote say, “no, we need a different kind of vote for this matter?”

A: The committee will review and discuss this.

Q: May volunteer faculty vote? Also, can we refer to lecturers as lecturers and not temporary faculty? May department chairs exclude faculty from voting if they deem them as not having participated in the deliberations?

A: The committee will review and discuss this.

Q: On line 96, it says, “The ideals of higher education are rooted in principles of democracy and shared governance.” This policy is actually curtailing the voting rights of temporary faculty, and many temporary faculty members serve on curriculum committees. This policy goes against the ideal of shared governance. What is the rationale behind limiting the rights of temporary faculty?

A: Lecturers are part time and the consensus in all the feedback O&G got is that one problem departments are faced with is that there are more lecturers in terms of FTEF than regular faculty, and regular faculty have made a commitment and are here long term as compared to lecturers that are only here part time.

Q: There is some ambiguity in section 7.1.3. If I am present but do not speak, am I participating? One could read it that way. This needs to be rethought.

A: The committee will discuss this.

Q: Can we define what deliberation means?

A: The committee will review and discuss this.

Q: In our department, we have moved to all electronic voting. Voting remains open for a week after a department meeting to allow people that are not there to vote. This policy appears to change that. There is also an implicit assumption in the policy that committee actions get reported out to the department at some level. And, I just don't understand section 3.9.

A: Section 3.9 came up because faculty felt pressure to participate and there is no obligation for faculty, other than regular faculty members, to serve on committees that deliberate on matters entrusted to the regular faculty. This is curriculum predominantly, but we will play with the language to clarify.

---

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1635, Amendment A to University Policy S16-8, Selection and Review of Administrators (First Reading)*. Concern has been raised that having students on every administrator search and review committee may not be a reasonable arrangement. This amendment allows some flexibility in the formation of search and review committees to enable them to be tailored to the particular position up for review or selection.

**Questions:**

Q: Can you give an example of an administrator position that would not require student representation?

A: I don't know, but the issue was raised in the search for the AVP of Faculty Affairs.

Q: I strongly believe that students should be represented on every search for the high level administrator searches. If there are exceptions, then we should lay out those exceptions instead of passing a blanket rule.

A: I hear you. What I would say is that there is an obligation in this policy to keep the search committees small, but to have diverse representation. The relationship between students and the AVP of Faculty Affairs position is indirect at best, and if you are going to create a search or review committee and have a student it is at the price of one less chair or faculty member. Maybe this is a place where a student is not needed.

Q: Did O&G check with students to see if they had objections to relinquishing their seats on these committees?

A: There is a student representative on O&G.

Q: In the spirit of shared governance, I would suggest that if there is an instance where a student might not be needed, they should be consulted and given the opportunity to decline participation rather than creating a policy that suggests that they not serve on the committee. I can't see any Vice President position where the students will not be working with the VP on some level.

A: That point was raised. In committee discussions the example used was the hiring of faculty in the departments. Students are not usually involved in those committees. However, I get your point.

---

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1634, Constitutional Amendment, Modification of Senate Constitution Related to Membership (First Reading)*. This is the first step in a process that leads to an amendment to our constitution. Amendments to our constitution can be proposed to the faculty-at-large provided that amendment receives a majority vote in the Academic Senate. Today is the first step in that process and this amendment proposes a change in the administrators on the Academic Senate. This amendment would remove the VP for University Advancement and replace him with the Chief Diversity Officer.

**Questions:**

Q: What is the position of our VP of University Advancement on his removal from the Senate?

A: We have had multiple discussions with the VP of University Advancement and he feels strongly that his time could be better spent in service to the university by using the time he would be spending in the Senate and on the Executive Committee to work with donors. The direct relationship of University Advancement to the business of the Senate is very small and he recognizes that. He would still be happy to make annual reports to the Senate on the University Advancement activities. Part of the discussion involved consideration for having the Senate Chair serve on the Tower Foundation Board. This is in response to a long-standing discussion in the Executive Committee with all the administrators.

Q: Could you give us the history of this Vice President's service on the Academic Senate?

A: When you look back in time, this position did not have a very robust advancement effort. That component of their work was not as big as it is now. The Vice President of University Advancement has only been on the Academic Senate for about eight years.

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

**A. CSU Statewide Senators –**

The Faculty Affairs Committee that Senator Sabalius sits on discussed the Academic Freedom policy. The Chancellor's Office is now in discussion with the ASCSU on Academic Freedom. The Faculty Affairs Committee also discussed how to provide long term lecturers with more job security, and plans to increase tenure density.

Senator Van Selst's committee focused primarily on the Quantitative Reasoning Taskforce and discussed how are they actually going to move forward towards implementation.

Senator Lee's committee, the School and Government Affairs Committee, discussed how to inform the legislators that if they want to legislate on transfers between community colleges and the CSU, they should consult with the ASCSU and find out what's actually going on before determining that there should be some regulation put in place. There will be some communication to the legislature about that.

Essentially, there was a claim that we were doing very little to help students out whereas we have devoted many, many worker hours to helping out.

Finally, the Chancellor's request for a tuition increase was discussed and it sounded like there may be an equivalency between the amount requested and the amount required for faculty raises, so there might be an effort for some state bodies to pit students against faculty. However, our committee decided we should support our Chancellor, because we have to fund the things we say we are going to do and wait until there is actually an eminent move to raise tuition before making a final decision on that matter.

Senator Sabalius announced that 15 years ago when he started on the CSU Statewide Senate, the way we treated lecturers was an exception. However, over the last decade more and more campuses have come to include lecturers and now look to us as an example of how to do things. We are still on the forefront in this area and set a good example for the entire CSU system.

**B. Provost – None**

**C. Vice President of Finance and Administration –**

Because of the rain this evening the campus safety walk has been moved to Wednesday night. It will be at 7:30 p.m. starting near the FD&O Building.

Also, one of our students sent an email this weekend about the noise in some of the classrooms from the construction. VP Faas will be meeting with the student this week. If faculty have problems with this just contact VP Faas and he will work with FD&O to come up with a solution to the problem.

**Questions:**

Q: Now that students are in the new dorm, can you give a brief update on how things went?

A: I'd be happy to, but I'm going to let VP Blaylock speak to that. However, they are really happy. The students and resident advisors are thrilled.

Q: What is the formula we have for staffing our Police Department?

A: We are down a number of officers right now. We are competing with the City of San Jose for officers. Some of our officers have been taken by surrounding cities. We are trying to make sure our salaries are comparable with the surrounding areas to be competitive. We are sourced from a budget point of view correctly. This is done on a campus-by-campus basis.

Q: A number of years ago we had a non-motorized vehicle policy. I've noticed recently that there are two buildings where we seem to be having skateboard activity that is damaging the buildings and one of those is the new stairs adjoining the ramp from the 4<sup>th</sup> street garage. There are chunks out of the steps now. The other is the Northside of Uchida Hall where the new Auditorium is, the outside wall seems to have been used for skateboarding.

A: We will look at those areas.

Q: There is another area and it is the courtyard near Sweeney Hall. The skateboarding disrupts my class.

A: We will look into that.

**D. Vice President for Student Affairs –**

Moving the students into CV2 was very special for a number of reasons. First, we had a chance to reflect on the transition itself. Our custodial and maintenance staff all

worked together. This Wednesday we are having a lunch for our custodial staff to express our appreciation for the spur of the moment work they did for us.

What was amazing was that students were scheduled by floors to move into CV2 and we had hired professional movers to help the students. At 7 a.m. the students were waiting outside to move in, they didn't want to wait for the movers. These students then came back and helped their friends move in. The students have given the new resident halls the title of "The Hotel," because there are so many amenities.

This is our fifth year hosting about 2,000 high school students and they will be able to apply to the campus while they are here on this Saturday. For the first time in the history of financial aid in this country, the deadline has been moved up to October 1<sup>st</sup> from January 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup>, so students are applying now. We have a chance on Saturday to get them into the financial aid conversations. All 31 districts in this region will be represented.

One of the faculty Senators referred a student to Cal Fresh and in two days that student was receiving \$150 a week for food. Also, last week we had the food pantries here and in one hour we served 329 students in the Event Center. VP Blaylock and Provost Feinstein are talking about doing some cooking demonstrations, because at the event they were giving away recipe cards and some students didn't know how to cook the produce that we had. We may have a "Chopped" competition with faculty.

The African-American College Readiness Summit is next month. This summit has grown so large the middle and high schools had to be separated.

**Questions:**

Q: Can you tell us a little more about what you are doing to counsel some of our homeless students about getting financial aid?

A: The Economic Crisis Response Team (ECRT) launched a new website August 1, 2016. As of September 16, 2016, there were 103 students that had signed up for food or housing. We know that hungry students don't do well in classes. Often students do not know how to complete the financial aid process, or where to turn in a crisis. Over 70% of the students referred to us come from faculty.

Q: Where do faculty send a student they suspect is homeless?

A: Send them to the Financial Aid and Scholarships or to VP Blaylock directly.

Q: Could you create some materials for the campus that tell us where to direct students for what services? Maybe these materials could be made a part of the new faculty orientation?

A: Yes.

**E. Associated Students President (AS) – None**

**F. Vice President for University Advancement – None**

**IX. Special Committee Reports – None**

**X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.**



Senate Executive Committee Meeting  
October 17, 2016  
12-1:30 p.m. ADM 167

Present: Kimbarow, Peter, Shifflett, Schultz-Krohn, Mathur, Frazier, Lee, Kaufman, Riley, Faas, Feinstein, Peréa

Absent: Papazian, Lanning

Guests: Wong, Bailey

1. Approval of 10/3/16 meeting minutes – approved (11-0-2).
2. Consent Calendar – approved
3. Introductions: Kathy Wong Lau and Jaye Bailey
  - a. Kathy Wong Lau meeting with various groups addressing equity and gender
  - b. Jaye Bailey, discussed how to modify the model used at Southern Connecticut State University to fit the needs of SJSU, concentrating on Faculty Affairs since the SJSU model differs from the SCSU organization
  - c. Executive members introduced themselves to Kathy & Jaye
4. Discussion of how the new organizational model of Faculty Affairs and Human Resources will work
  - a. Role of the Chief of Staff, VP of Organizational Development (Jaye Bailey) to keep the process moving forward and to insure that the process is followed regarding sabbaticals, hires, Fulbright etc. but the Provost and Faculty Affairs (and faculty) will make the decisions regarding these items, decision making resides in the Provost's office and under Faculty Affairs; the process of following the requirements will be under the Chief of Staff, VP of Organizational Development (Jaye Bailey)
  - b. The completion of faculty searches and decisions made under Provost and Faculty Affairs division but the task of following all the required processes (regulations) will be under the Jaye Bailey
5. Feedback regarding the Budget presentation
  - a. Overall positive response of allocating a Senate session dedicated to the review of the budget
  - b. Suggestions
    - i. Provide more budget trends
    - ii. Provide interpretation of how this budget relates to future goals
    - iii. Provide comparison of our budget to other institutions
  - c. Best practices will be included in future presentations
6. BAC Nomination –Shannon Miller – approved (13-0-0)
7. Responsibilities on Budget Advisory Committee (BAC)
  - a. Suggestions to create a report regarding the purpose of the BAC and how it relates the Strategic Planning Process (SPP)
  - b. Connection to SPP, need for communication between these two groups, BAC to serve as an independent group reviewing the budget
  - c. BAC needs to review and address budget issues
    - i. Analyze problems areas

- ii. Ramifications of issues/problem areas
    - iii. Less creating the budget and more the communication regarding the budget
  - d. Committee membership has various skills regarding financial management and that fosters greater clarity in messaging
  - e. O & G sees BAC as providing feedback on SPP and overall budget, not specific
  - f. BAC could also be involved with looking at the structure of the auxiliaries, also solicit information from various groups regarding budget
  - g. BAC needs to feed into the SPP for future funding and planning
- 8. Policy Committee Updates
  - a. PS – two items coming to Senate
    - i. Revised SOTEs policy and open ended SOLATE items; Demographic items will not be presented
    - ii. Amendment to searches to allow search committee members to participate from outside the department; many departments do not have sufficient numbers of faculty to serve on various RTP committees
    - iii. Electronic privacy policy – looking at the CSU policy
  - b. C&R – 6 referrals
    - i. RSCA has been through 3 drafts
    - ii. Program Planning – two working groups looking at data elements and policy
      - 1. Guidelines are drafted in C & R but brought to the Senate as an informational item
      - 2. Policy to be reviewed as a Senate item
    - iii. ULGs adopted by SJSU but these do not fit well with graduate degrees; looking at a separate set of ULGs for graduate programs – task force to look at graduate level ULGs; should C & R focus on this task or have an operating committee develop the graduate level ULGs
  - c. O&G - constitutional amendment
    - i. Voting rights – completed
    - ii. Concurrent faculty membership on policy and operating committees is being addressed but this problem is also seen with administrators
  - d. IS&A – not likely to have anything for upcoming Senate meeting
    - i. Looking at the requirements for continuing graduate students and how to manage students completing graduate degrees
    - ii. Enforcement of study/conference day where there should be no scheduled events
    - iii. Grade distribution reports
- 9. Updates
  - a. President
  - b. Provost – schedule for the 4 candidates for the position of Dean of Engineering; videos of the four candidates will be available after all presentations are completed; same process will be used for the search for the Dean of Business
  - c. Student Affairs – efforts to bring resources to campus, specifically food to support students, partnerships to provide a mobile food pantry, 329 students served in one hour; signing up students for CalFresh; Nov 5<sup>th</sup> – almost 2000 students to come to campus to visit; Nov 7<sup>th</sup> is the Black Student Thanksgiving – Student Union 5:00 pm
  - d. Administration and Finance – meetings with City of San Jose regarding buildings – possible host to Cinequest since Camera 12 closed; Science Building discussions are moving forward

- e. Associated Students – legacy week and workshops on social justice; collaborated with MOSAIC; working with Native American organizations; develop a statement regarding athletics from a student's perspective, all 16 board members are now appointed to AS

10. The meeting adjourned at 1:40 p.m.

These minutes were taken and transcribed by the Associate Vice Chair, Winifred Schultz-Krohn on October 17, 2016. The minutes were edited by Chair Kimbarow on October 18, 2016, and were approved by the Executive Committee on October 31, 2016.

Executive Committee Meeting  
October 31, 2016  
12-1:30 p.m. ADM 167

Present: Kimbarow, Peter, Shifflett, Schultz-Krohn, Mathur, Frazier, Lee, Kaufman, Riley, Faas, Feinstein, Peréa, Lanning

Absent: Papazian

1. Approval of 10/31/16 meeting minutes – approved (14-0-0).
2. Consent Calendar – approved
3. Updates:
  - a. From the Chair of the Senate:

The Soul Food Thanksgiving dinner will be held on November 7, 2016 from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. in the Student Union. Over 90 people have registered for the event.
  - b. From the Provost:

The Staff Appreciation Breakfast was today. The Provost celebrated with several hundred staff members.

The recent Kaleidoscope Event presented by the School of Music and Dance at the Hammer Theatre on October 22, 2016 was excellent.

There are two dean searches in progress (Engineering and Business). Both have 4 candidates under consideration.

The Academic Affairs Division is undergoing the restructuring Provost Feinstein has spoken about in recent meetings.

The Provost would like to see the changes that are being proposed when new policies are sent to him for review prior to the President signing them.
  - c. From the VP of Student Affairs:

On Saturday, October 29, 2016, over 65 families were in attendance as part of the Spartan Family Weekend. There was a full day of events including campus tours, library open house, educational workshops, and a welcome reception with student performances, and a tailgate event and football game.

On Friday, October 28, 2016 ten families on the Parent Advisory Board met for dinner. The dinner ended at 8:30 p.m. and they were all still there as late as 10:30 p.m.

The Student Affairs Division will host an event called the Spartan East Side Promise (SESP) on Monday, November 7, 2016. Components of this event include a campus and library tour, resource fair, class audits, and more in an effort to provide a hands-on experience to higher education. The purpose of SESP is to prepare first-time college students and their families for college academic expectations, and to promote a college-going culture.
  - d. From the VP of Administration and Finance:

There are two good candidates for the AVP of FD&O. The search is currently in the background-checking phase.

VP Faas had the Campus Safety Walk last Wednesday night from 7:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. An SJSU student sent an email complaining about the noise from the construction work on campus. VP Faas apologized and asked faculty and students to contact either FD&O or him directly if there is an issue that needs to be addressed.

The committee discussed the closure of the 7<sup>th</sup> Street garage for construction work. The disabled parking in this garage is right outside of the Speech and Language Clinic in Sweeney Hall, and many disabled people enter from that garage area that is now closed.

- e. From the VP of University Advancement:
  - The Executive Committee discussed a confidential naming opportunity.
  - The VP of University Advancement distributed lapel pins to committee members, and to the AS President to give to the AS Board of Directors.
  - The Inspiration to Innovation Gala Event will be held in the Student Union on May 4, 2017, the evening of the Presidential Investiture.
  - The new Chief of Staff is working on putting together recommendations for Long Beach for Honorary Doctorates from SJSU.
  
- f. From the AS President:
  - AS is planning a number of activities in support of Native American Heritage month.
  - AS is working on a formal statement in support of athletics.
  - AS just appointed a Chief Elections Officer.
  - AS has been conducting discussions regarding the Chancellor's proposed tuition fee increase.
  - AS support measure B for better roads for commuters.
  
- 4. The committee discussed the Voting Rights policy and proposed changes to be discussed by the Organization and Government Committee. Potential changes since the last reading have included removing language that refers to regular and temporary faculty and substituting that with Tenure/Tenure-Track and Lecturers. Proposed modifications also include placing decisions regarding lecturers' voting rights at the department level. It was noted that the RTP policy specifically excludes lecturers from voting on RTP.
  
- 5. The committee discussed the Editorial Change Policy. The committee discussed whether a policy that had an editorial change approved by the Executive Committee would go back to the President in hard copy for an additional signature. Current practice is that an editorial change is recorded in the minutes and reported to the Senate, but is not forwarded to the President in hard copy for another signature. The committee discussed the fact that the President sits on the Executive Committee and the vote to make the change would require the unanimous consent of the Executive Committee, and that would include the President.
  
- 6. The meeting adjourned at 1:53 p.m.

These minutes were taken and transcribed by the Senate Administrator on October 31, 2016. The minutes were edited by Chair Kimbarow on November 12, 2016, and were approved by the Executive Committee on November 14, 2016.

**Consent Calendar**

21-Nov-16

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Last Name/First Name</b>	<b>Term</b>	<b>Phone</b>	<b>Seat/College</b>
Student Fairness Committee	Maffini, Cara	2017	924-3629	Counselor Education
Parking, Transportation & Traffic Advisory Committee	Merz, Miwa	2018	924-3519	Business
Instruction and Student Affairs	Kinney, Kevin	2107	408-795-5624	Director of SJSU Housing
Instruction and Student Affairs	Medrano, Eric	2017	924-6257	Student
Institutional Review Board	He, Daoping	2019	924-3591	Business
Graduate Studies and Research	Xiaohong, Iris	Fall 2016	924-3542	Business
Student Success Committee	Vitale, Robert	2019	924-3532	Business

**REMOVE:**

Instruction and Student Affairs	Rees, Matthew			
Instruction and Student Affairs	Torres-Mendoza, Juritzi			
Student Success Committee	Virick, Meghna			
Athletics Board	Tian, Yao	on leave for 16/17		
Academic Senate	Torres-Mendoza, Juritzi			





**SAN JOSÉ STATE  
UNIVERSITY**

**Academic Senate Office**  
ADM 176, 0024

**GENERAL ELECTIONS**  
2017 Calendar

Timeline	Election Events
Friday, February 3	Cover letter with instructions and petitions sent to all faculty. Petitions on line/attached.
Friday, February 24	Nominating petitions due in Senate Office (ADM 176).
Monday - Friday February 27 – March 3	Verification of petitions and preparation of online ballots.
Monday, March 6	Ballots online and info sent to college deans’ offices electronically.
Friday, March 17	Online voting/ballots due by 5 p.m. to Senate Office and AVC.
Monday - Friday March 20 – March 24	CoC Representative verifies appointment times for faculty that voted with College Deans’ Offices.
Monday – Tuesday April 3 – 4	Final ballot count by the Senate AVC and Senate Administrator.
Monday, April 10	Results reported to Academic Senate with percent of voters.

Approved: November 13, 2016  
Committee on Committees

Approved: November 14, 2016  
Executive Committee

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_  
Academic Senate



1 San José State University  
2 Academic Senate  
3 Organization and Government Committee  
4 November 21, 2016  
5 First Reading  
6

AS 1621

## 7 **Policy Recommendation** 8 **Departmental Voting Rights** 9

10 Legislative History: Rescinds F66-6 related to voting privileges for faculty on leave.  
11 Rescinds F02-4 and S98-2, both of which pertained to departmental voting rights. F02-4  
12 arose from deliberations about whether and how lecturers may participate in the  
13 nomination and selection of department chairs, and a concern that the previous policy  
14 (S98-2) appeared to exclude lecturers from such participation. Rescinds F07-5  
15 regarding voting privileges for faculty assigned to more than one representative unit.  
16

17 Whereas, The voting rights associated with decisions relating to policies,  
18 curricula, and other business of academic departments requires  
19 clarification; and  
20

21 Whereas, Meaningful engagement of departmental faculty in decision making is an  
22 essential component of shared governance, assuring the integrity of  
23 departmental business, and our commitments to students; now, therefore,  
24 be it  
25

26 Resolved: That S98-2, F07-5 and F66-6 be replaced by this policy, and be it further  
27

28 Resolved: That the administration, in consultation with the Senate, investigate  
29 options and subsequently acquire an appropriate resource to facilitate  
30 online voting at all levels (department, college, university), and be it further  
31

32 Resolved: That the attached policy be implemented following approval by the  
33 President, and be it further  
34

35 Resolved: That until such time as S14-8 (selection & review of department chairs) is  
36 updated, section 1.a. of F02-4 will remain in effect while all other  
37 provisions of F02-4 will be replaced by this policy. Thus, lecturer votes  
38 related to department chair recommendations remain advisory. S14-8 is  
39 presently under revision by Professional Standards. Once their work is  
40 completed, this section of F02-4 will become obsolete.  
41

42 1.a. Names for inclusion in the list of qualified (tenured or probationary)  
43 faculty to serve as department chair may be recommended by all regular  
44 and temporary faculty in the department. Normally, a department meeting  
45 shall be held at which persons whose names are proposed as chair shall  
46 be open for discussion, and all regular and temporary faculty may attend  
47 and participate. All faculty may then vote by secret ballot (proportional

48 votes for part-time faculty, as provided below) on all candidates proposed  
49 and willing to serve. The name or names of those receiving a majority vote  
50 of the regular (tenured and probationary) faculty shall be forwarded to the  
51 President via the College Dean as the nominee(s) of the department. A  
52 statement of the vote of all faculty, broken down into two categories – vote  
53 by regular faculty and by temporary faculty, including the actual number of  
54 votes cast in each category - will be forwarded to the President via the  
55 College Dean for information.

56  
57 Rationale: A number of voting related issues have arisen over the intervening years  
58 following implementation of F02-4. These include consideration of the various  
59 procedures employed in academic departments for such issues as curricular changes,  
60 operating policies, determinations of what issues require formal or informal votes by  
61 faculty, implications of appointment fractions, and the opportunities as well as the  
62 limitations of electronic voting resources. This proposed update to the departmental  
63 voting rights policy seeks to provide greater clarity and guidance on such issues. In  
64 addition, as revisions were made, voting guidelines found in both the Senate  
65 constitution (Article II section 3c) and bylaws (1.7) were taken into consideration.

66  
67 Retention of section 1.a. of F02-4 is needed to temporarily bridge the gap between  
68 rescinding F02-4 and update of S14-8 (selection & review of department chairs).  
69 Subsequently the revision of S14-8 will contain all information regarding department  
70 chair nomination and selection procedures.

71  
72 Note: Regarding department chair assignments, the current CSU/CFA Agreement  
73 states that:

74  
75 20.30 Department chairs shall normally be selected from the list of tenured or  
76 probationary faculty employees recommended by the department for the  
77 assignment.

78 20.31 Such department chairs shall perform duties and carry out responsibilities  
79 assigned by the President

80 20.32 Such department chairs shall be appointed by the President and shall serve at  
81 the pleasure of the President.

82  
83 Approved: 11/14/16  
84 Vote: 10-0-1  
85 Present: Curry, Bailey, Shifflett, Rajkovic, Higgins, Boekema, Boylan-Ashraf,  
86 Laker, Ormsbee, Hart, Tran  
87 Absent: Grosvenor  
88 Financial Impact: Depending on decisions regarding tools for online voting, one-time  
89 costs for the purchase of software can be expected.  
90 Workload Impact: Potential reduction as a result of the clarification of processes and  
91 potential prevention of time consuming corrections resulting from  
92 inappropriate procedures.  
93  
94

95

96

## Departmental Voting Rights

97

98 The ideals of higher education are rooted in principles of democracy and shared  
99 governance. This policy affirms the primacy of faculty members in decision-making  
100 related to the academic/educational matters of departments. The voting rights  
101 described in this policy exclude all personnel matters. Separate policies govern  
102 (including voting procedures) Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (S15-7) and the  
103 Selection and Review of Department Chairs (S14-8).

104

### 1. Definitions

106

107 1.1 Departmental voting rights are the rights granted to faculty to have a voice, through  
108 voting, on matters pertaining to their roles and responsibilities in the department(s) they  
109 are formally affiliated with, including but not limited to governance, curriculum, and  
110 leadership.

111 1.1.1 Engagement in deliberations prior to voting should be the norm as it  
112 leads to more informed decision making.

113 1.1.2 Those leading departments and/or committees should strive to  
114 make agendas and supporting materials available in a reasonable  
115 time in advance of meetings.

116

117 1.2 Department of permanent assignment. For purposes of this policy, "department of  
118 permanent assignment" refers to the academic department or equivalent unit officially  
119 designated for a faculty member at the time of appointment, or the department to which  
120 he/she has been subsequently officially reassigned to on a permanent basis.

121

122 1.3 Formal vote. A formal vote is one taken following a motion, a second to the motion,  
123 and discussion preceding a vote. Unless otherwise stipulated by the department's  
124 tenured and tenure track faculty, Roberts rules of order shall apply.

125

### 2. Department Faculty Voting

127

128 2.1 Those eligible to vote are those who have departmental voting rights in the area(s)  
129 being voted on.

130

131 2.2 In order to provide flexibility at the department level with regard to departmental  
132 voting, departmental guidelines/bylaws can be established by tenured and tenure track  
133 faculty to clarify lecturers' departmental voting rights (proportional to their assignment)  
134 on some or all department issues excluding those assigned to tenured and tenure track  
135 faculty by university policy or departmental guidelines/bylaws.

136

137 2.2.1. Given variations in the culture, history, and composition of departments  
138 with regard to tenure density, differences in the extent to which lecturers will be  
139 engaged in decision making are expected. In establishing departmental  
140 guidelines/bylaws pertaining to matters which lecturers vote on, departments  
141 might take into consideration a range of issues including, but not limited to, years

142 of experience, terminal degrees and other qualifications, entitlements, years of  
143 service in the department, and appointment level (e.g., .2, .5, 1.0)

144  
145 2.2.2 Departmental voting rights, when granted, take effect at the beginning of  
146 the next semester (fall or spring) and remain in effect until departmental  
147 guidelines/bylaws are modified. When modified the changes go into effect at the  
148 beginning of the next semester.

149  
150 2.3 Voting by tenured and tenure track faculty is required for the nomination of  
151 department chairs (S14-8); merging, dividing, transferring, or eliminating academic units  
152 (S13-9); and department name changes.

153  
154 2.4 For development and/or changes to departmental curricula, curricular policies, and  
155 program requirements for students (inclusive of establishing or modifying courses,  
156 standard texts and materials), voting by tenured and tenure track faculty is required.

157  
158 2.4.1 Depending on a department's structure and size, voting may be conducted  
159 by: (a) representative committees; (b) tenured and tenure track faculty only; or (c)  
160 the entire faculty in a department (if voting rights have been granted to lecturers  
161 – per 2.2 above).

162  
163 2.4.1.1 When a department establishes a committee responsible for  
164 making curricular decisions, a faculty member not on the curriculum  
165 committee may request a review of a specific committee decision. This  
166 request must be voted on and approved by the department faculty in order  
167 for a committee decision to be reviewed.

168  
169 2.5 Departments may choose to vote (or not vote) on a range of matters beyond those  
170 specified in sections 2.3 and 2.4. However, faculty voting rights do not extend to matters  
171 that may contravene university policies, violate the Collective Bargaining Agreement,  
172 interfere with departmental management and participation in university governance, or  
173 fall under the responsibilities of the department chair or equivalent.

### 174 175 **3. Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty Departmental Voting Rights**

176  
177 3.1 Unless otherwise specified by department guidelines/bylaws, voting rights for  
178 departmental curricula, curricular policies, and personnel matters, including constitution  
179 of decision-making committees for these matters, shall be entrusted to the department's  
180 tenured and tenure track faculty.

181  
182 3.2 Tenured and tenure-track faculty members have departmental voting rights in  
183 proportion to their permanent assignment in a department and can choose not to  
184 exercise that right (not vote).

185  
186 3.3 Tenured and tenure-track faculty members with teaching assignments outside their  
187 department of permanent assignment may request departmental voting rights  
188 proportional to their assignment in that department. The faculty member may  
189 subsequently be granted departmental voting rights following a vote of the tenured and

190 tenure track faculty in that department. Faculty retain their full voting rights in their  
191 department of permanent assignment.

192

193 3.3.1 Departmental voting rights, when granted, take effect at the beginning of the  
194 next semester (fall or spring) and remain in effect throughout the faculty member's  
195 service in the department.

196

197 3.4 Leaves. Tenured and tenure track faculty members on an approved leave retain  
198 departmental voting rights.

199

200 3.5 Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP). Faculty participating in FERP retain  
201 departmental voting rights. They retain a full vote regardless of their academic  
202 assignment in a given semester.

203

204 3.6 Tenured and tenure track faculty suspended under article 17 of the bargaining  
205 agreement (CBA) retain their departmental voting rights. T & TT faculty suspended  
206 without pay under article 19 lose their departmental voting rights during the term of their  
207 suspension.

208

209 3.7 Departmental voting rights of tenured and tenure track faculty are suspended for  
210 any semester in which the individual holds a full-time administrative (i.e. MPP), or other  
211 full-time non-faculty position, in the university.

212

213 3.8 Departmental voting rights of tenured and tenure track faculty members end upon  
214 termination of employment or retirement.

215

#### 216 **4. Departmental Voting Rights for Lecturers**

217

218 4.1 Lecturers have proportional voting rights in the department(s) in which they serve  
219 equal to the proportion of time they are teaching in the department(s), not to exceed 1.0  
220 in any department.

221

222 4.2 Lecturers can participate in votes on departmental matters excluding those  
223 entrusted to tenured and tenure track faculty by department guidelines/bylaws or  
224 university policy. Lecturers can choose not to exercise their voting rights (not vote).

225

226 4.3 Proportional voting rights of lecturers may fluctuate with fall and spring  
227 appointments.

228

229 4.4 Leaves. Lecturers on an approved partial leave retain the proportional voting rights  
230 of their teaching assignment. Those on full leave relinquish their voting rights for the  
231 duration of their leave.

232

233 4.5 Lecturers suspended under article 17 of the CBA retain their departmental voting  
234 rights. lecturers suspended without pay under article 19 lose their departmental voting  
235 rights during the term of their suspension.

236

237 4.6 Departmental voting rights of lecturers are suspended for any semester in which the  
238 individual holds a full-time administrative (i.e. MPP), or other full-time non-faculty  
239 position, in the university.

240  
241 4.7 Departmental voting rights of lecturers end upon termination of employment or  
242 retirement.

243  
244 **5. Department Chair Voting Rights.**

245  
246 5.1 As primary steward of a department, the permanent department chair has full voting  
247 rights in the department they chair during their term regardless of the level of  
248 assignment (i.e., 0.4, 0.6).

249  
250 5.2 Faculty assigned as interim or acting chair for a department outside their  
251 department of permanent assignment have full voting rights in the department they are  
252 serving in as interim or acting chair. They also retain full voting rights in their permanent  
253 department. They can vote on all 'home' departmental matters.

254  
255 **6. Visiting faculty, students, staff, and other non-faculty voting rights.**

256  
257 While visiting faculty, students, staff, or other non-faculty individuals may participate on  
258 departmental committees and groups, they may not be granted departmental voting  
259 rights.

260  
261 **7. Voting Methods and Procedures.**

262  
263 7.1 Tenured and tenure track faculty will determine the acceptable methods,  
264 mechanisms and timelines for voting (e.g., paper ballots, double envelope, email,  
265 online, show of hands, etc.) for department matters in general. They may select  
266 different methods for various types of decisions unless otherwise stipulated or  
267 precluded by University policy, collective bargaining agreement, and/or laws.

268  
269 7.1.1 Because of the importance of deliberations in resolving conflicts and  
270 determining policies, proxy and absentee voting on departmental matters is  
271 permissible only if authorized by a specific departmental guidelines/bylaws.

272  
273 7.1.2 Any selected method must include a process for verifying the proportion and  
274 eligibility of those voting, and provide the option of a vote to 'abstain'.

275  
276  
277 7.2 If the Department does not have an established voting procedure at the time a  
278 decision is to be made, a vote by secret ballot conducted by the department or  
279 committee chair shall be the default practice.

280  
281 7.2.1 When a vote has been by secret ballot, the method used and the reporting of  
282 results must be done in such a way as to not reveal the identity of voters even to the  
283 chair.

284

285 7.3 Within departmental committees, faculty members can decide what process they will  
286 use for decision making (e.g., formal votes, consensus, secret ballots).  
287

1 San José State University  
2 Academic Senate  
3 Organization and Government Committee  
4 November 21, 2016  
5 Final Reading  
6

AS 1628

7 **Policy Recommendation**  
8 **Modification of Bylaw 15 Pertaining to Editorial Changes in**  
9 **Policies and Management Resolutions**

10  
11 Legislative History: Modifies bylaw 15c passed in Spring 2016 which pertains to the  
12 correction of errors in policy recommendations and Senate management resolutions.  
13

14 Whereas: The revisions made to bylaw 15c in Spring 2016 were intended to permit  
15 changes to be made to documents by the Executive Committee rather  
16 than have minor matters brought to the full senate, and  
17

18 Whereas: The language in the modification was subsequently found to actually  
19 restrict action, therefore be it  
20

21 Resolved That section c of bylaw 15 be modified as follows:  
22

23 c) When a policy recommendation or Senate Management Resolution is found to  
24 contain editorial errors, that when corrected would not change the intent of the policy or  
25 resolution, the Senate Chair, following consultation with and unanimous consent from,  
26 the Executive Committee can correct the error(s). The edited version of the document  
27 approved by the executive committee will be submitted to the President for final review  
28 and signature. Approved editorial corrections shall be recorded in the Senate Executive  
29 Committee meeting minutes and changes will be made by Senate staff to the document  
30 being corrected. If the editorial changes are not approved by the Executive Committee  
31 or the President, the document will be returned to the appropriate policy committee for  
32 revision and brought to the Senate for debate and vote.  
33

34 Rationale: This modification recognizes that the need for editorial corrections are often  
35 not detected until after a recommendation has gone to the President or has been  
36 implemented. The matter of timing should not result in the Senate having to take up  
37 discussion of changes to documents that do not change the intent of a policy or  
38 resolution. In addition, the change does not alter the President's final signature  
39 authority on University Policies.  
40

41 Approved: 11/14/16

42 Vote: 11-0-0

43 Present: Laker, Bailey, Shifflett, Rajkovic, Higgins, Ormsbee, Boekema,  
44 Hart, Boylan-Ashraf, Tran, Curry

45 Absent: Grosvenor

46 Financial Impact: None expected

47 Workload Impact: No change from current situation



7 **Policy Recommendation**  
8 **Concurrent Membership on Operating and Policy**  
9 **Committees**

10  
11 Legislative History: Modifies bylaw 6.11 which pertains to Standing Committees  
12 (membership)  
13

14 Whereas: There is a conflict of interest when a committee member concurrently  
15 serves on an operating committee and the parent policy committee, and  
16

17 Whereas: Encouraging diversity in the formation of university senate committees is  
18 an essential component of shared governance, and  
19

20 Whereas: Administrative representatives might concurrently serve on policy and  
21 operating committees out of necessity, therefore be it  
22

23 Resolved That bylaw 6.11 be modified as follows: (addition of sections a, b, & c)  
24

25 6.11 Appointments of faculty to operating committees shall be for staggered three-year terms  
26 unless otherwise specified. After service for a full three-year term, members should be  
27 reappointed only in special circumstances. Appropriate administrative officers or their officers or  
28 designees shall be included on operating committees as ex officio members.  
29

- 30 a) Faculty serving on a policy committee are ineligible to serve on any operating committee  
31 reporting to the same policy committee.  
32 b) The Committee on Committees chair will assure that when appointments are made they  
33 take into consideration part (a).  
34 c) To the extent possible, designation of administrative representatives to operating  
35 committees and their parent policy committee should not result in concurrent  
36 membership. If concurrent membership is unavoidable, the administrator will serve as an  
37 ex officio nonvoting member on the operating committee and an ex officio voting member  
38 on the parent policy committee unless otherwise dictated by university policy pertaining  
39 to committee membership.  
40

41 Rationale: There is a potential conflict of interest if a committee member serves on an  
42 operating committee that makes a recommendation to the parent policy committee and  
43 in essence is voting twice on the same item. The recommendation proposed would  
44 keep policy and operating committees operating independently and diminish the  
45 possibility of crossover membership. In addition, with the new RTP standards in place  
46 this fall 2016 and the explicit expectations for service, this bylaw change would result in  
47 more service opportunities for faculty.

48  
49 Approved: 11/14/16  
50 Vote: 10-0-1  
51 Present: Laker, Curry, Shifflett, Rajkovic, Higgins, Ormsbee,  
52 Boekema, Hart, Boylan-Ashraf, Tran, Bailey  
53 Absent: Grosvenor  
54 Financial Impact: None expected  
55 Workload Impact: No change from current situation.

6  
7  
8  
9 **Amendment B to**  
10 **University Policy S15-6**  
11 **Appointment of Regular Faculty Employees;**  
12 **Composition of Recruitment Committees**  
13  
14  
15

16  
17 **Resolved:** That S15-6 be amended as shown in the strikeout and underline of the  
18 following excerpt from the policy.  
19

20 ***Rationale:** This revision of S15-6 adds flexibility to the composition of faculty*  
21 *recruitment committees, so that departments (at their option) may elect*  
22 *members from outside their department to assist on searches. This may be*  
23 *especially useful for departments who are seeking to recruit faculty with*  
24 *interdisciplinary perspectives and desire the help of faculty from other*  
25 *departments.*  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31  
32 **Approved:** November 14, 2016  
33

34 **Vote:** 8-0-0  
35

36 **Present:** Peter, Green, Lee, Reade, Kauppila, Caesar, Hamedi-Hagh, Marachi  
37

38 **Absent:** White, Hwang  
39

40 **Financial Impact:** No direct impacts. It is possible that this policy, by clarifying process,  
41 could result in some savings.  
42

43 **Workload Impact:** No direct impacts unless departments choose to expand their  
44 recruitment committees.  
45  
46

47  
48  
49 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**  
50 **Amending**  
51 **S15-6 Appointment of Regular Faculty Employees;**  
52 **Composition of Recruitment Committees**  
53 .....

54 3.2 Composition of department recruitment committees

55 3.2.1 Recruitment committees shall be elected by vote of the tenured and  
56 probationary faculty of the department by secret ballot.

57 3.2.2 The size of the recruitment committee shall be determined by the  
58 department, and Recruitment committees should preferably contain  
59 a minimum of five **or more** members but never fewer than three  
60 members. Departments may elect members to a recruitment  
61 committee from a related discipline outside their department, ~~If a~~  
62 department lacks three qualified members, it may elect a faculty  
63 member from a related discipline to serve, whose willingness should  
64 first be ascertained. **Such an External** election is required if needed  
65 to achieve a minimum of three committee members, but may also be  
66 used to broaden the expertise **or diversity -or-composition** of the  
67 committee. The department which will be home to **the** prospective  
68 position must always supply the majority of the members of any  
69 recruitment committee, **unless it lacks at least two faculty of**  
70 **appropriate rank to serve.**

71 3.2.3 The majority of faculty on any recruitment committee must be tenured  
72 and must not have entered an early retirement program.  
73 Probationary faculty and faculty in an early retirement program may  
74 serve if elected, provided they do not constitute a majority of the  
75 committee, and provided that they receive the permission of the  
76 President as per the Collective Bargaining Agreement (12.22).<sup>1</sup> That  
77 permission must be requested by the Department and is reviewed by  
78 the Dean and Faculty Affairs.

79 3.2.4 If a search is authorized for a tenured position, then the recruitment  
80 committee may not include probationary faculty.

81 3.2.5 The Chair of the Department shall normally be a voting *ex officio*  
82 member of the recruitment committee and shall Chair the committee.  
83 If the Chair elects not to serve, then the committee shall choose its  
84 own Chair from among its elected members.

85 3.2.6 Departments may create independent recruitment committees for  
86 each search, or carry out all searches with a standing recruitment  
87 committee, provided all recruitment committees conform to the  
88 requirements of policy.

89 3.2.7 Recruitments for department chairs should be conducted in

---

<sup>1</sup> CFA/CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement, 2014-2017. 2

90 accordance with the provisions of S14-8 (Sect VI.1.)

91 .....

1 San José State University  
2 Academic Senate  
3 Organization and Government Committee  
4 November 21, 2016  
5 Final Reading  
6

AS 1634

7  
8 **Constitutional Amendment**  
9 **Modification of Senate Constitution Related to Membership**

10 Legislative History: Modifies article II, section 2 of the constitution of the Academic  
11 Senate. The amendment would remove from the representatives of the administration  
12 the position of Vice President for Advancement and add the Chief Diversity Officer.  
13

14 Whereas: Periodic examination of the needs of the senate for robust collaboration  
15 and communication with the administration along with the changing roles  
16 and responsibilities of administrative positions over time are important,  
17 and  
18

19 Whereas: A new Chief Diversity Officer for SJSU has been appointed, and  
20

21 Whereas: Opportunities to connect with and receive information from the Vice  
22 President for Advancement can be achieved without the necessity of a  
23 designated seat on the Senate, therefore be it  
24

25 Resolved That article II, section 2 of the Senate's constitution be modified as  
26 follows:  
27

28 Article II, Section 2. Administration representatives shall consist of the President, the  
29 Provost, the Vice President for Administration and Finance, ~~Vice President for~~  
30 ~~Advancement~~, the Vice President for Student Affairs, and Chief Diversity Officer, ex  
31 officio; and four (4) academic deans, at least two of whom shall be deans of colleges,  
32 elected by the academic deans for staggered two-year terms.  
33  
34

35 Rationale: This modification is recommended in light of the demands on the time of the  
36 Vice President for Advancement being predominantly external. The linkage for the  
37 Senate to the person in this position may be best achieved through targeted  
38 communication and reporting to the Senate and Executive Committee. In addition, the  
39 Senate and the new Chief Diversity Officer will benefit significantly from direct  
40 participation of the person in this role with the Senate.  
41

42 Approved: 12-0-0

43 Date: 10/7/16

44 Present: Laker, Curry, Shifflett, Rajkovic, Higgins, Ormsbee,  
45 Boekema, Bailey, Grosvenor, Hart, Tran, Bailey

46 Absent: None

47 Financial Impact: None expected

48 Workload Impact: No change from current situation.

1 San José State University  
2 Academic Senate  
3 Organization and Government Committee  
4 November 21, 2016  
5 Final Reading  
6

AS 1635

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

11 Legislative History: Modifies S16-8 to allow for the participation of lecturers and tenure  
12 track faculty on the search and review committees for academic Deans. The current  
13 policy on the selection and review of administrators precludes lecturers and tenure track  
14 faculty from serving on selection and review committees for academic deans.

15  
16 Whereas: The selection and review of academic deans is important to all faculty in a  
17 college, and  
18

19 Whereas: Current policy provides seats on selection and review committees for only  
20 tenured faculty, and  
21

22 Whereas: Tenure track faculty and lecturers may be interested in serving on search  
23 and/or review committees for their academic dean, therefore, be it  
24

25 Resolved That section 1.3.1 of S16-8 be modified as follows:  
26

27 **1.3.1 Special Procedures for Deans of Academic Colleges:** The search committees  
28 for college deans shall be composed of nine members: three ~~tenured~~ faculty, two of  
29 whom are tenured, who are not department chairs, elected by and from the college  
30 faculty (but not more than one from any department); two department chairs from the  
31 college, elected by its department chairs; one staff member, elected by the staff of the  
32 college; one student, one Dean (from outside the college searching for a Dean), and  
33 one member of the community, each designated by the Provost.

34 Elections for the three faculty representatives from the college shall be arranged and  
35 conducted by ad hoc election committees comprised of all department chairs in that  
36 college. Each department in the college shall nominate one student from its majors, and  
37 the Provost shall designate one student as a committee member from the departmental  
38 nominees. The community member should have experience or expertise relevant to one  
39 or more of the programs in the college.

40  
41  
42 Rationale: All faculty do have the opportunity to participate in the review and selection  
43 of academic deans through solicited input. However, providing the faculty in each  
44 college with the option to elect any faculty member who is interested in serving on a  
45 selection or review committee, permits each college to select from among all its faculty

46 members the representatives they would like to have serve on a selection or review  
47 committee.

48

49

50

51 Approved by email vote: 11/15/16

52 Vote: 11-0-0

53 Present: Curry, Shifflett, Rajkovic, Higgins, Hart, Boylan-  
54 Ashraf, Bailey, Laker, Tran, Ormsbee, Grosvenor

55 Absent: Boekema

56 Financial Impact: None expected

57 Workload Impact: No change from current situation



**SENSE OF THE SENATE  
RESOLUTION**

**Reaffirming San José State University's Commitment  
To an Inclusive Campus Climate  
And Our Determination to Provide  
A Safe, Supportive, and Welcoming Community**

- Whereas, San José State University has long regarded the diversity of its campus community, including students, staff, faculty, administrators, guests and affiliates, as a source of strength and empowerment and a core element of Spartan pride; and
- Whereas, The recent Presidential election featured rhetoric that was often violent, racist, misogynistic, homophobic, ableist, islamophobic, anti-semitic, nativist, ethnocentric, and xenophobic; and
- Whereas, This deeply disturbing, divisive, and hateful rhetoric has exacerbated fear among many members of the SJSU community, and has also created feelings of disrespect, alienation, disenfranchisement, moral outrage and indignation; now, therefore, be it
- Resolved, That San José State University reaffirm our commitment to our policy on diversity, S01-13, and its requirement to maintain "an environment free from discrimination and harassment," and to "advocate inclusion, respect and understanding at a level above that which is minimally required by law." Be it further
- Resolved, That we affirm our commitment to maintain a campus climate where everyone, each with a unique experience and perspective, as well as those with shared group perspectives, feels welcome, respected, and valued. Among the many diverse backgrounds and experiences that we appreciate and celebrate are the following: ancestry, citizenship status, immigrant status, national origin, accent, language, race, color, ethnicity, age, (dis)ability, medical condition, genetic information, sex, sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, marital status, incarceration history, creed, religion or lack thereof, veteran's status, socioeconomic status, and political ideology; be it further
- Resolved, That we also affirm our commitment to promote the free and civil exchange of ideas, and to ardently defend free speech, freedom of inquiry, and academic freedom. Students, faculty, and staff have the right to challenge the ideas of others with dignity and civility, and without fear of retaliation; be it further
- Resolved, That we will defend and stand in solidarity with those among us who have been affected by or specifically targeted by the vile rhetoric of the recent Presidential campaign, and we will take all lawful and educational actions to welcome, support, protect, and keep safe all members of our campus community. Be it further
- Resolved That we urge our administration to take all appropriate actions under the law and our educational mission to hold accountable individuals who threaten our students, faculty, or staff. Be it further

Resolved That this resolution be distributed to all students, faculty, staff, the press, the Academic Senates of the CSU, the Chancellor of the CSU, and the Board of Trustees of the CSU; be it further

Resolved, That pursuant to Article V of the Constitution of the SJSU Academic Senate, this resolution be referred to the general faculty electorate of SJSU for endorsement by the full faculty.

*Approved (Executive Committee): November 14, 2016*

*Vote: 12-0-0*

*Present: Kimbarow, Peter, Shifflett, Kaufman, Frazier, Mathur, Riley, Lee, Perea, Feinstein, Faas, Schultz-Krohn*

*Absent: Papazian, Blaylock, Lanning*

*Approved (Professional Standards Committee): November 14, 2016*

*Vote: 8-0-0*

*Present: Peter, Green, Lee, Reade, Kauppila, Caesar, Hamedi-Hagh, Marachi*

*Absent: White, Hwang*

*Financial Impact: No direct impacts*

*Workload Impact: No direct impacts*

6  
7  
8 **Policy Recommendation**  
9 **Required Enrollment for Culminating Graduate Students**

10  
11  
12 Legislative history: Replaces F11-2  
13

14  
15 **Whereas** Graduate students receive a Report-in-Progress (RP) grade on thesis,  
16 project, or comprehensive exam courses while they are in the process  
17 of completing their research, scholarly or creative activity, report, and/or  
18 comprehensive exams; and

19 **Whereas** Graduate culminating experiences involve considerable university  
20 resources, including faculty and staff time and library resources; and

21 **Whereas** Payment of fees for these services sets a standard to the student,  
22 faculty, and university that the professional nature of the relationship  
23 must be respected and that all parties involved must provide their  
24 needed and timely input in the process; and

25 **Whereas** In the CSU, there is a two-tiered payment structure (0-6 units or greater  
26 than 6 units) in regular session courses. Fees solely for 1 unit can be  
27 charged only through special sessions; and

28 **Whereas** Most universities require enrollment (with fees) of graduate students  
29 as they work on their culminating experiences, including at least nine  
30 other CSU campuses; and

31 **Whereas** This policy recommendation has the unanimous support of the  
32 University Graduate Studies & Research Committee;

33 **Whereas** The current system of ensuring continuous enrollment for SJSU  
34 graduate students who have completed all of their requirements  
35 for a master's degree except for the culminating experience is to  
36 allow them to take a 1-unit UNVS or Departmental 290R course,  
37 which limits the fees collected from students to one small  
38 amount; and

39 **Whereas** Services rendered to graduate students working on their  
40 culminating experiences by the faculty vary from minimal to  
41 considerable, justifying the need for a multi-tiered system of  
42 continuous enrollment courses with different fee requirements;  
43 therefore be it

44

45 Resolved

46

47 1. All master's candidates on a thesis (Plan A) or creative project (Plan C) track must  
48 receive credit for at least one unit of a Departmental 299 course as a degree  
49 requirement to receive a master's degree. The total number of units for which  
50 master's degree credit may be received is governed by the limitation that not more  
51 than six semester units shall be allowed for a thesis or project, as stipulated in the  
52 California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Article 7, Section 40510. This limitation  
53 extends to all project or thesis-preparation (both Plan B) courses (often 298s  
54 although other course numbers are also used) but not to research classes. There is  
55 no limitation on the number of 298, 299, or other project or thesis course units that  
56 can be taken so long as credit (CR grade) is not received in project or thesis courses  
57 until all degree requirements are met and the units in excess of six do not appear on  
58 the degree candidacy form. Unless a thesis or dissertation is approved by Graduate  
59 Studies within Graduate & Undergraduate Programs (GUP), thesis (299) and  
60 dissertation (599) units may not be awarded credit (CR grade). Credit in Plan B  
61 project (usually 298s) and comprehensive exam-preparation courses must also be  
62 delayed until the completion of the project or passage of the exam, respectively. No  
63 more than 12 units of dissertation writing credit (599) can be applied to the doctoral  
64 degree.

65 2. Effective Fall 2012, once a culminating experience supervisory course (thesis,  
66 dissertation, project, or comprehensive exam-preparation course required in the  
67 degree program) has been taken with any non-letter grade (RP, I, CR), graduate  
68 students will be required to enroll in regular session (state-supported) classes to  
69 finish the requirements of their degree program or a special session (self-supported)  
70 class, UNVS 1290R or Departmental 1290R, S, or T, for 1 unit every fall and spring  
71 semester until the culminating experience is completed. Thus continuous enrollment  
72 is required of graduate students once they have begun their culminating experience  
73 work and have completed all other course requirements for their degrees. For  
74 programs that split the culminating experience coursework into two or more  
75 semesters, the requirement of continuous enrollment applies to that period following  
76 the second of those semesters unless other degree-required coursework is still to be  
77 taken. Grades of CR must not be given by instructors until the students have  
78 completed the course requirements; however, if they mistakenly are, this policy still  
79 allows the students to take 1290 although the instructor of the class will be asked to  
80 change the grade to an RP or I. If any work for a class is handed in after the last day  
81 of the semester, the student must enroll the following semester even if the work  
82 simply completes an incomplete or RP. Students receiving C- or lower letter grades

83 or NC grades in their culminating courses must repeat those courses and are  
84 therefore not eligible for the 1290 courses. Summers are excluded from this  
85 continuous enrollment requirement. As previously, departments can require retaking  
86 298, 299, 599, or other project or exam-preparation courses if it is deemed that the  
87 student needs repetition of the instruction given in those courses. The exception to  
88 this requirement for course enrollment each semester until graduation is for students  
89 with an official leave of absence from the university. However, as per University  
90 Policy S15-3, VIII, 2, graduate students on RP status will not be eligible for a leave of  
91 absence other than a medical or military leave, except under rare circumstances.  
92 Continuous enrollment will be substantiated by GAPE prior to processing of the  
93 “Verification of Culminating Experience” memo indicating degree completion.

94 3. A three-tiered system of special session classes will be developed, numbered  
95 Departmental 1290R, 1290S, and 1290T, with progressively higher student fees. For  
96 each graduate program (plan, concentration, and major), the department/school shall  
97 propose via submission to the university of the Academic Major/Minor Program  
98 Creation or Change form one of the three courses to be associated with each  
99 program. Justification for the choice shall be made on the basis of average  
100 departmental or school faculty workload in bringing the students to completion of their  
101 culminating experiences. Programs in which thesis research is conducted in  
102 research labs with virtually daily contact with a faculty member, for example, are  
103 expected to be able to justify higher fees and the top-tier class (1290T). The mid-tier  
104 class (1290S) would be justified by the occurrence of weekly meetings with students  
105 to help them with culminating experience work. Students will be able to take only the  
106 course stipulated for that particular program, and no program may have more than  
107 one continuous enrollment course; however, departments with multiple programs will  
108 be able to designate different continuous enrollment courses for the individual  
109 programs. The course choice will be conveyed to students at a minimum by means  
110 of the departmental website and the university catalog. College curriculum  
111 committee, college dean (or representative), and GUP approval will be needed for the  
112 course selected.

113 4. To ease the workload on the departments in the transition to this system and the  
114 implementation thereafter, Graduate Studies will provide assistance in the form of  
115 various supports. The Associate Dean of Graduate Studies will be the instructor of  
116 record for all of the courses, including the ones with departmental prefixes; thus, he  
117 or she will enter the grades for the courses, all of which will be CR grades (note that  
118 the original RP in the culminating experience class will remain until the culminating  
119 experience has been completed, at which point the graduate advisor will change the  
120 RP grade to a CR). Graduate Studies will set up the classes each semester with the  
121 College of International & Extended Studies, meaning students will have access to

122 the courses without departmental management being needed. Graduate Studies will  
123 further provide templates/examples of the paperwork (curriculum forms and syllabi)  
124 needed to institute the classes for any department that requests them, reducing to a  
125 minimum the effort needed on the part of the department staff.

126 5. The 1290R, S, and T courses are to be made available as an accommodation to  
127 graduate students to maintain continuous enrollment in fall and spring semesters at a  
128 reduced cost in comparison with regular session enrollment. Students may elect to  
129 retake the regular session thesis, dissertation, project, or exam-preparation course in  
130 which the original RP or I grade was obtained instead of taking one of the special  
131 session 1290R, S, or T courses; therefore, the 1290 courses are not an absolute  
132 degree requirement.

133 6. For the UNVS 1290 and Departmental 1290R, S, and T courses, the special session  
134 fees will be set by the Provost and the Academic Planning & Budget unit. The UNVS  
135 course has been created by GUP and is available in the semester immediately  
136 following approval of this policy. The Departmental 1290 courses, if not already  
137 created, must be proposed by the programs. For those departments/schools that fail  
138 to create the classes, their students will take the UNVS 1290R course. For the UNVS  
139 1290R course, the Provost will determine the distribution of the fees collected but will  
140 not include distribution to the colleges and departments/schools with which the  
141 students are affiliated. Retroactive course add fees will apply for students who enroll  
142 in any of the 1290R, S, or T courses after the end of the semester.

143 7. Students who register in courses in which RP is a grading option will be notified, by  
144 the Registrar in collaboration with GUP, of this policy and the fee ramifications if an  
145 RP grade is earned. All reading committees and project, thesis, dissertation, and  
146 comprehensive exam-preparation advisors in classes in which RP is a grading option  
147 will be notified by GUP of the fee ramifications and timeline applicable if an RP grade  
148 is awarded. Students who earn an RP grade will be notified by the Registrar on how  
149 to enroll in the special sessions course.

150 8. The university requires continuous enrollment of graduate students once all degree  
151 requirements are satisfied other than the culminating experience; thus “stopping out”  
152 for even a single semester is not permitted at this point in the graduate career. This  
153 latter requirement applies to all graduate students, even if the culminating experience  
154 is a set of comprehensive exams for which there is no departmental preparation  
155 class. Therefore, all graduate students, no matter the culminating experience and  
156 courses associated with it, must be enrolled each semester once all degree  
157 requirements other than the culminating experience are fulfilled.

158 9. Appeals of the 1290 course fee on the basis that the delay in completing the  
159 culminating experience was substantially beyond the student’s control can be made

160 to the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies. Results of the appeal will be  
161 communicated to the student within four weeks of the student filing the appeal.

162 10. Implementation of this policy will be begun one academic year after its approval.

163

164 Approved: November 7, 2016

165 Vote: 12-0-2

166 Present: Bruck (non-voting), Kaufman, Khan, Medina, Medrano, Miller, Ng  
167 (non-voting), Pérea, Sen, Simpson, Spica, Sullivan-Green,  
168 Trousdale, Walters, Wilson, Whyte

169 Financial Impact: Addition of funds to the university through added fee collection,  
170 financial cost to students

171 Workload Impact: Additional workload to Graduate Admissions & Program  
172 Evaluations to review registration of students in RP status prior to  
173 processing "Verification of Culminating Experience;" additional  
174 registrar workload to transfer students to special session status;  
175 additional Graduate Studies workload to administer the program,  
176 review appeals, handle retroactive adds, and alleviate problems  
177 with the system.

1 San José State University  
2 Academic Senate  
3 Organization and Government Committee  
4 November 21, 2016  
5 First Reading  
6

AS 1638

7 **Policy Recommendation**  
8 **Modification of Bylaw 2.2 Pertaining to the Term Length for**  
9 **Senate Chair**

10  
11 Legislative History: Modifies bylaw 2.22 sections a, b, c, and d which pertain to the term  
12 of the Academic Senate Chair.

13  
14 Whereas: The Senate Chair regularly puts forth a proposal to extend her/his term at  
15 the first regular meeting of the Senate in spring semester preceding the  
16 policy committee reports, and  
17

18 Whereas: The Senate regularly agrees to the proposal for extension and has done  
19 so for nearly two decades, therefore be it  
20

21 Resolved That sections a, b, c, and d of bylaw 2.22 be modified as provided in this  
22 policy recommendation.  
23  
24

25 Rationale: This modification updates current bylaws in a way that recognizes the  
26 historical record of actions in the Senate with respect to extending the term of the Chair  
27 to two years. This modification furthers effective leadership through providing stability at  
28 the outset with regard to the length of service of the Senate Chair.  
29  
30  
31

32 Approved: 11/14/16

33 Vote: 10-0-0

34 Present: Curry, Shifflett, Rajkovic, Higgins, Ormsbee, Boekema, Hart,  
35 Boylan-Ashraf, Tran, Bailey

36 Absent: Grosvenor, Laker

37 Financial Impact: None expected

38 Workload Impact: No change from current situation  
39  
40  
41



42 **Modification to bylaw 2.22**

43

44 2.2 Election Procedures for Senate Officers

45

46 2.21 Senate officers, other than the Chair, Past Chair and Faculty-at-Large  
47 Representative, shall be elected from the faculty members of the Senate annually for  
48 one-year terms. Nominees for Chair of Professional Standards must be tenured full  
49 professors.

50

51 a) The Chair will serve for a term of two years.

52

53 b) The Vice Chair will be elected for a term of two years and automatically succeed to  
54 the office of Chair at the adjournment of the last Senate meeting of the spring semester  
55 in which the Chair's term ends. If the chair serves less than the two-year term, the vice  
56 chair will succeed the chair at that time and begin his/her two-year term. In such a case  
57 an election will be held to elect a new vice chair, and the term of the new vice chair will  
58 be 2 years.

59

60 c) The Chair, at the conclusion of their term will serve for one year as Past Chair. In  
61 alternate years, as needed, when there will be no past chair, a Faculty-at-Large  
62 Representative shall be elected at the end of spring semester to fill the Past Chair's  
63 position on the Executive Committee for the following year. The Past Chair (or Faculty-  
64 at-Large) representative on the Executive Committee will serve as the Senate's  
65 representative on the University Library Board.

66

67 d) No chair shall serve for more than two years in succession.

68

69

70

7  
8 **Policy Recommendation**  
9 **Modification of Bylaw 4.1: Senate Executive Committee**  
10 **Membership**

11 Legislative History: Modifies bylaw 4.1 which pertains to the membership of the Senate  
12 Executive Committee by removing the Vice President for University Advancement and  
13 adding the Chief Diversity Officer.  
14

15 Whereas: The Senate's Executive Committee needs to include members of the  
16 administration whose work most directly intersects with the development  
17 of university policy, and  
18

19 Whereas: The evolution of the role of the Vice President for Advancement has led to  
20 the need for extensive off campus engagements, and  
21

22 Whereas: Issues related to campus diversity remain central to our ability to create  
23 and sustain a welcoming environment for faculty, staff, students, and  
24 administrators, therefore be it  
25

26 Resolved That bylaw 4.1 be modified as follows:  
27

28 4.1 The Executive Committee shall be composed of all Senate officers  
29 (as defined in bylaw 2), the President, the Provost, the Vice President for  
30 Administration and Finance, the Vice President for Student Affairs, ~~the~~  
31 Vice President for Advancement, the Chief Diversity Officer, and the  
32 President of the Associated Students. For purposes of these bylaws, the  
33 elected members of the Executive Committee are the Senate officers.  
34

35 Rationale: This change to the representation of administrators on the Senate Executive  
36 Committee is recommended to best meet the needs of the Senate leadership to have  
37 ongoing dialogue with the administrators most directly connected to the work of the  
38 Senate. Information from the VP for advancement can still be obtained through  
39 reporting to the Senate and Executive Committee. In addition, the senate and the new  
40 chief diversity officer will benefit significantly from direct participation of the person in  
41 this role on the Executive Committee.  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 Approved: 11/14/16  
47 Vote: 11-0-0  
48 Present: Laker, Curry, Shifflett, Rajkovic, Higgins, Ormsbee,  
49 Boekema, Hart, Boylan-Ashraf, Tran, Bailey  
50 Absent: Grosvenor  
51 Financial Impact: None expected  
52 Workload Impact: No change from current situation

1 San Jose State University  
2 Academic Senate  
3 Instruction & Student Affairs Committee  
4 November 21, 2016  
5 First Reading  
6

AS 1640

7 **Policy Recommendation**  
8 **Final Examinations, Evaluations, or Culminating**  
9 **Activities Policy**

10  
11  
12 Legislative history: Replaces S06-4

13  
14 Whereas: University policy S06-4 requires that all classes have a final  
15 examination or other appropriate culminating activity at the  
16 scheduled final examination time; and

17  
18 Whereas: There is concern that some faculty have taken it upon themselves  
19 to reschedule exams to times that are not allowed by current policy,  
20 including during the regular semester or "Study/Conference Day,"  
21 to the disadvantage of students; and

22  
23 Whereas: The choice of appropriate culminating experience is a curricular  
24 matter that rightly belongs to the faculty; therefore be it

25  
26 Resolved: that the policy statement below be adopted as university policy on  
27 final examinations, evaluations, or culminating activities.  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 **Final Examinations, Evaluations, or Culminating**  
33 **Activities Policy**

34  
35  
36 Faculty members are required to have a culminating activity for their courses,  
37 which can include a final examination, a final research paper or project, a final  
38 creative work or performance, a final portfolio of work, or other appropriate  
39 assignment.  
40

41  
42 Time Frame for Culminating Activities:

43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87

Final examinations must occur during the scheduled final examination time in each course. The required submission date and time for take-home examinations, final papers or other culminating activities must fall no earlier than the first day of the final examination period. Final exams shall not be given, nor culminating activities due, during regularly scheduled class periods or on "Study/Conference Day." Supervision and individual study courses (180, 184, 297, 298, 299) are not required to have a culminating activity.

Exceptions to Time Frame for Culminating Activities:

Exceptions for the above time frame are justified in the following circumstances:

- a. Performance courses in which it is impractical to examine each student individually in the time period assigned for final examinations; e.g. performance courses in theater arts, music, or athletics.

Circumstances in which students may request the rescheduling of a culminating activity:

- a. A student may request the rescheduling of a culminating activity if there is a verifiable emergency.
- b. A student may request the rescheduling of a culminating activity if three or more are scheduled/due within a 24-hour period. Requests must be made at least three weeks prior to the last class meeting of the semester.
  - i. If one of the three or more culminating activities scheduled for the same day is a paper or project, the deadline for the paper/project will be moved to a mutually agreeable time within the final examination period.
  - ii. If three or more finals are scheduled on the same day, the student may request an alternative exam date and/or time from any one of the instructors.
  - iii. If an alternate time for a regularly scheduled final exam period cannot be arranged between the student and the instructor, the rescheduled exam will be taken during the final exam-makeup period.
- c. In the case of either a verifiable emergency or the student having more than two culminating activities scheduled within a 24 hour period: if a student and instructor are unable to reach agreement on rescheduling, the chair will first be consulted. If

88 no agreement can be found through the chair, the dean (or  
89 designee) will be consulted.

90

91 Oversight of Culminating Activities

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

- a. The department chairperson will oversee culminating activities (examinations; portfolios; research or creative projects) in a manner that assures that the rules for culminating activities are followed. If a dispute arises, the dean (or designee) will be consulted.

100 Approved: November 14, 2016

101

102 Vote: 16-0-0

103

104 Present: Campsey, Kaufman, Khan, Medina, Medrano, Miller, Nash,  
105 Ng (non-voting), Perea, Sen, Simpson, Spica, Sullivan-  
106 Green, Trousdale, Walters, Wilson, Whyte

107

108 Financial Impact: None

109

110 Workload Impact: Small workload addition for chairs to educate and consult  
111 with faculty members about appropriate culminating  
112 experiences.

113