

SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE

2022/2023

Agenda

December 5, 2022/2:00 to 5:00 pm

via Zoom: <https://sjsu.zoom.us/j/84128591849?>

If you would like to attend this meeting, please contact the Chair (alison.mckee@sjsu.edu) or the Senate Administrator (Eva.Joice@sjsu.edu) for the password.

- I. **Call to Order and Roll Call:**
- II. **Land Acknowledgement:**
- III. **Approval of Minutes:**
Senate Minutes of November 7, 2022
- IV. **Communications and Questions:**
 - A. From the Chair of the Senate
 - B. From the President of the University
- V. **Executive Committee Report:**
 - A. *Minutes of the Executive Committee – Executive Committee Minutes of October 31, 2022*
 - B. Consent Calendar –
Consent Calendar of December 5, 2022
 - C. Executive Committee Action Items –
- VI. **Unfinished Business:**
- VII. **Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation):**
 - A. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
AS 1839, Amendment D to University Policy F12-6, Evaluation in Effectiveness in Teaching for all Faculty (Final Reading)

AS 1840, Amendment A to University Policy F17-3, Selection and Review of Department Chairs and Directors (Final Reading)

AS 1842, Sense of the Senate Resolution, In Opposition to the Exclusion of Faculty Early Retirement Program Faculty From Pandemic Compensation (Final Reading)

- B. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
AS 1836, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy S16-17, Academic Certificate Programs: Review and Approval Process (Final Reading)
- C. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
AS 1832, Senate Management Resolution, Update to the Standing Rules of the Academic Senate (Final Reading)
- D. University Library Board (ULB):
- E. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
AS 1841, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy S22-2, Student Excused Absences (Final Reading)

VIII. Special Committee Reports:

IX. New Business:

Election of Chair for the Curriculum and Research Committee for Spring 2023.

X. State of the University Announcements:

- A. Statewide Academic Senators
- B. Provost
- C. Associated Students President
- D. Vice President for Administration and Finance
- E. Vice President for Student Affairs
- F. Chief Diversity Officer
- G. SJSU Faculty Trustee (by standing invitation)

XI. Adjournment

2022-2023 Academic Senate Minutes
November 7, 2022

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

Ex Officio: Present: Van Selst, Curry, Rodan, Chuang, McKee Absent: None	CHHS Representatives: Present: Sen, Smith, Chang, Baur Absent: None
Administrative Representatives: Present: Perez, Faas, Day, Del Casino Absent: Wong(Lau)	COB Representatives: Present: Tian Absent: Chen
Deans / AVPs: Present: Ehrman, Meth, d'Alarcao Absent: Kaufman	COED Representatives: Present: Mathur, Muñoz-Muñoz Absent: None
Students: Present: Chadwick, Saif, Treseler, Rapanot, Herrlin, Sheta Absent: None	ENGR Representatives: Present: Kao, Wong Absent: Sullivan-Green
Alumni Representative: Absent: Vacant	H&A Representatives: Present: Khan, Frazier, Kataoka, Lee, Riley, Han Absent: None
Emeritus Representative: Present: Jochim	COS Representatives: Present: French, Andreopoulos, Muller, Shaffer Absent: None
Honorary Representatives: Present: Peter, Lessow-Hurley Absent: Buzanski	COSS Representatives: Present: Sasikumar, Haverfield, Pinnell, Raman, Gomez Absent: Hart
General Unit Representatives: Present: Monday, Higgins, Masegian, Flandez, Lee Absent: None	

II. Land Acknowledgement: Senator Chang presented the Land Acknowledgement.

III. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–
 The Senate Minutes of October 10, 2022 were approved as amended (46-0-2).

IV. Communications and Questions –
A. From the Chair of the Senate:

On this Thursday from 5:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. the President will host the Senate Fall Reception at his house for the annual get-together.

We will be trying a new way of voting today. If it doesn't work then we can use zoom polls again. In the in-person Senate meetings the chair can call for a

raised hand vote. Along those lines, at the bottom of your zoom screen you will see reactions. Please click on that. We will be using the green check mark for a yes vote, the red X for a no vote, and the coffee cup to abstain. Please be patient, it may take a few minutes to count the votes.

Questions: None

B. From the President:

[Interim President Perez] I'm on my way to the airport and have about three minutes to talk. Lots of great things going on this Homecoming week that culminated with Fire in the Fountain. There were hours of entertainment mostly from our students and clubs. There were Salsa dancers, Mariachi playing, and fire dancers there. Also, if you haven't seen our AS President fly through the air in dance, you need to. It was spectacular. The Indian Student Organization had an event about a week ago and there were 800 students there. It was great. They taught me how to dance a little bit.

We have really been kicking up planning and getting support for the Alquist building. As you are aware it will have faculty, staff, and graduate student housing. We hope to get it to the Board of Trustees (BOT) early next year.

We've got some challenges. Enrollment is down across the CSU system. There are only two campuses where enrollment isn't down and we are not one of them. There is a lot of work going on across the system and here at SJSU to try and increase enrollment across the CSU for next year.

We are having "Transforming Communities" events going on over the next couple of weeks. We will be hosting events for both our local communities and our on-campus communities.

Questions: None

V. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

Executive Committee Minutes of October 3, 2022—No questions

Executive Committee Minutes of October 17, 2022—No questions

B. Consent Calendar:

AVC Katoaka presented the Consent Calendar of November 7, 2022. There was no dissent.

C. Executive Committee Action Items: None

VI. **Unfinished Business:** None

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

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

Senator Haverfield presented ***AS 1838, Amendment B to University Policy S19-3, University Writing Requirements/Guidelines, University Writing Committee (First Reading)***.

At the heart of this amendment is the elimination of the Writing Skills Test (WST). The proposed elimination is based on recent memorandum from the Chancellor's Office. This states that the use of a standard examination may no longer be used to demonstrate competency in writing under the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR).

Questions:

Q: I noticed that a change in this policy is that Area Z is now replaced with Writing In the Disciplines (WID). Does this reflect a renaming on the campus of Area Z, because it is not actually a General Education (GE) course. It is often thought to be GE, but it is not a GE course. Would the committee consider removing the word "other" in line 104 in the packet, because it is not a GE course? Have you considered having the Writing Requirements Committee (WRC) review all the 100W, because that is the writing expertise committee on our campus?

A: Area Z is referred to as WID in the GE Guidelines. I will take the other questions back to the committee.

Q: Does this make the 100W not a requirement senior year, is that what we are saying here?

A: No, this just eliminates the WST. Students will now take the directed Self Placement Writing Skills Test. This is a student's assessment of their own writing skills and competency. If needed then they can take a preliminary writing skills course which is 100A before they take 100W, or they can just take 100W. It is recommended to take that between the 60- and 90-unit mark.

Q: I notice that in the proposal it talks about there not being any financial and workload impact. I'm wondering if you get rid of the WST shouldn't that change the workload of the people that give it and process it? Also, there used to be a fee associated with taking the WST, so won't that affect the finances?

A: That is a great question. We will review and revise accordingly.

Q: Would the committee consider indicating the changes in renaming of the committee members?

A: Yes.

Q: In the amendment it talks about there being minimal differences with the WST. Were there any empirical studies done to see if there were any significant differences between those that took the WST and those that did not?

A: There was an empirical study done by the University Writing Committee. I'm happy to share with you.

B. Organization and Government Committee (O&G): No report.

C. University Library Board (ULB): No report.

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

Senator Khan presented ***AS 1834, Amendment C to University Policy S09-7, Grading Symbols, Drop and Withdrawal; Assignment of Grades and Grade Appeals; Change of Grade; and Integrity of the Academic Record (Final Reading).***

Senator Van Selst presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to strike "individual" in line 253. Senator Riley presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to add "(s)" after instructor wherever it appears in "instructor(s) of record." Senator Van Selst presented two amendments that were friendly to the body. In line 266 replace "S07-6" with "S14-3", and in line 268 change "...receive a grade correction" to "receive a grade correction possibly overruling the instructor of record."

The Senate voted and AS 1834 passed as amended (44-0-1).

Senator Khan presented ***AS 1835, Amendment B to University Policy F20-1, Adding Classes After Advance Registration (Final Reading).***
The Senate voted and AS 1835 passed (45-0-1) as written.

E. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

Senator French presented ***AS 1839, Amendment D to University Policy F12-6, Evaluation in Effectiveness in Teaching for all Faculty (First Reading).***

Questions:

Q: Would the committee consider adding a line that says wherever the SOTES are accessible, the Rebuttals should also be accessible there as well?

A: I'm happy to take that back to the committee to discuss it. However, my understanding is that the SOTES are put directly into the University Personnel File so that would just be something we add into the policy, but it wouldn't change the current procedure.

Q: This is a question about clarification. In the red section about rebuttals it talks about “10 duty days.” Could you clarify the “10 duty days” rule?

A: Yes, 10 duty days is 10 working days for the faculty member so if that happens in the summer, then the faculty member has 10 duty days after returning from summer break to add that response. We had a lot of discussion about this. Faculty should not have to do this when they are not on duty.

Q: I’m wondering if that is going to be clear to faculty. It wasn’t to me.

A: I can take that back to the committee.

C: It is my understanding that faculty services provide calendars for everything associated with faculty processes, so can this be added to a calendar that you have 10 duty days to submit the rebuttal?

C: It seems like a lot of students don’t use SOTES or know they exist. It seems like we could be limiting the amount of accepted feedback now, and it seems like the feedback is already so little given the number of students we have that I would be a little bit concerned about suppressing student voices.

A: This language that we are specifically discussing in section IV is part of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). This is about communicating that SOTES exist, we don’t have the power to change it. The original SOTE will not be excluded. It will just have the rebuttal attached to it.

Q: If quoting the CBA then would the committee consider adding where it is taken from in the CBA?

A: Yes.

Senator French presented ***AS 1840, Amendment A to University Policy F17-3, Selection and Review of Department Chairs and Directors (First Reading)***.

Questions:

Q: In section 2.2 still contains the language that acting and interim chairs should be full professors unless there are no full professors to serve. Since this language was removed from the qualifications for chairs why was that language kept for acting and interim chairs? The language also suggests a public explanation for why someone was overlooked and this could lead to privacy concerns.

A: We pulled out the statement that ideally chairs should be full professors in the normal process since in the normal process the chair is elected by their peers, but there are a number of reasons why it is actually preferable to have the chairs be professors. If you are not a full professor, you cannot participate in the RTP process for someone going up for full professor. Another reason is that professors are relatively shielded from political fallout. Also, serving as department chair impacts RSCA and your

own RTP movement. So, we included that language for acting and interim chairs since these are meant to be temporary positions, and this should be given some thought for an acting or interim chair. There may be cases where a dean knows a compelling reason that a full professor should not be chosen and is overlooked and he/she will not be able to share that with the department. We don't have a good solution for this problem.

Q: There is a bizarre rationale. Can the committee clean-up that language?

A: I'm not sure what you are suggesting, please clarify.

Q: On line 67 it says, "The Provost raised some concerns. We think we've addressed those concerns." There is no content here. Drop the fluff out of the rationale.

A: I'm not sure I can clean-up the rationale from a previous committee.

C: [Senator Peter] I must have written that rationale. It probably made more sense then. Maybe there was a debate or specific concerns. I don't think there is anything that prevents the committee from changing the rationale or removing it.

A: I will take it back to the committee.

Q: Just to confirm, in all instances of selecting a department chair the department faculty will be consulted, even if it is over the summer?

A: Yes.

Q: I'm wondering about the use of the word rare with associate professors as chairs. It seems to me that over the years lots of associate professors have been chairs. Has your committee looked into how many department chairs are associate professors?

A: No we have not. The reason for that is we have pulled out that language from the normal nominating process. The committee felt that it should be a rare occurrence for the dean to select an associate professor over a full professor.

C: When I previously chaired Professional Standards, there were about 8 out of 50 department chairs that were associate professors. I don't think the rare language was meant for the chairs elected by their peers. I think it is meant to address specifically the acting and interim appointments that don't go through the current electoral process.

C: I want to caution the Senate about tying the hands of the deans in the acting/interim appointments. There is a lot that goes into that process and we set ourselves up when we make it a rare case when we select an associate professor. Having been an associate professor that served as a chair, I know exactly what that job is like. There are emergency situations and some faculty don't respond to email over the summer, so I think we need to be careful how much we tie the hands of the deans.

A: If the dean does consultation of any kind, what is the harm in reporting that to the department?

C: That part I don't have a problem with. I'm talking about the rare instances of appointing an Acting or Interim Chair. If people are not happy with the consultation then are we going to have a grievance because someone was appointed over the summer? There are things that only the dean, provost, and president know because they are involved in the whole process. I'd be happy to come to a PS Committee meeting and discuss.

A: I will take it back to the committee.

C: I appreciate the comments from the Provost. However, I do think that it is important to have some form of consultation with the faculty.

A: I will take it back to the committee.

VIII. Special Committee Reports:

Accessible Technology Initiative (ATI) Update to the Academic Senate, Time Certain: 2:45 p.m., Deanna Fassett, Assistant Vice Provost for Faculty Development

I'm really happy to be here with you on behalf of the Vice Provost for Faculty Success. We've worked up a presentation here that will let you know about some of the updates to the ATI since the last time we updated the Senate last fall. I'm happy to report that we have revitalized a number of governance structures related to accessibility on our campus. Among these is the ATI which never fully went away as a responsibility from the Chancellor's Office to the campus, but we were maybe not as transparent about who was involved in which committee.

We did not have a steering committee, which has now been revitalized and reconstituted. It is now more than a reporting body and what I mean is that we do more than just report to the Chancellor's Office. This is one line of governance that has become revitalized in the last year. The other is through the assistance of the Academic Senate, the University Council on Accessibility and Compliance recruited faculty participants and this group assists in evaluating campus policies and procedures. You can think of it this way: its charge extends beyond the technologies in use to support accessibility. It is also led by faculty co-chairs and it includes within it the Accommodations Review Board (ARB). The ARB is a smaller subcommittee that reviews cases related to student access or accommodation grievances or concerns. These are up and running and I'll tell you how you can get in touch with those committees. This is a change since last time.

Another significant change is that we now have an Accessibility Concern Reporting Form that is available on the <http://www.sjsu.edu/accessibility> pages. The form allows you to list where the accessibility issue is located, what type of issue it is, and what it is related to, e.g. facilities, information technology, etc. If there is an urgent need, the form directs you to reach out to the University Policy Department (UPD).

What happens with the form is that it comes into the Office of Faculty Success and the relevant ATI subcommittee members receive notice that this form has been filed. The appropriate campus partners are then notified based on the nature of the concern, and they work together with the ATI subcommittee member to develop the next steps. The person that filed the form should receive an update within three to five days. In addition, after everything is closed out, a final letter is sent to the person that filed the form.

We continue working on a new Accessibility SJSU website. You don't see the change yet, but we are working on it in the background. The website will allow you to search for what you need without having to know who and where to go to and should direct you.

The accessibility template for course syllabi is ready to go live. I'm happy to answer questions about the template, or come to your department and talk about it more fully. Also, Blackboard Ally has been integrated into Canvas. It provides faculty with a report on how accessible the materials are in a course. You can use Ally to fix your course content. Students can also use this tool to download different formats.

There are also a number of resources available through the Center for Faculty Development (CFD) and eCampus including consultation and observation with a team of excellent instructional designers who are way more than troubleshooters. You can access a version of our UDI course that ran over summer break. We have a self-paced Canvas course on Ally. There are also resources available through the Chancellor's Office as well. You can also reach out to me and the CFD and we can direct you as well.

Questions:

Q: The last time this was discussed in the Senate, Senators raised the issue of budget and the sharing of responsibility between the administration and the departments affected. Will the funding for whatever needs to be fixed come out of the budget for whatever office the issue is referred to?

A: That's a good question. Having been a chair and faculty member, I don't know if anyone could ever assume something would be absorbed in a given area's budget automatically. Some of this exceeds my knowledge of the institution. I do sit on the ATI Steering Committee and we have been discussing how to best utilize the funds associated with ATI, but we also know there are a lot of accessibility concerns that aren't necessarily technology-related. I think the form gives us a way to track and understand what those concerns are, where they are coming from, and try to commit to those endeavors. I don't think that we are at the point yet where there is an earmarked amount for accessibility-related concerns. I think it is an interesting question to try and figure out in the near future.

Q: Is there any initiative during this transition period to the new website that would allow students to get information sooner?

A: What I've noticed since I've been at SJSU is that people often do not report something that needs repair. Reaching out and letting someone know that something is broken on their website is something I've always appreciated. At the CFD and eCampus, we are always looking for ways to strengthen our website. We may not be exactly where we want to be, but we are trending in the right direction. I think you could use that reporting form and get it to the right person to make that change. I'm not sure if that answered your question, but it is an important thing to consider.

Q: Regarding copyrighted material, my constituents are not clear on whether you can have copyrighted materials captioned? Do we need to put everything on there? Where is the line? What absolutely has to be and can be withheld?

A: Regarding captioned materials, have them reach out to us. We can try and figure out how to help. We will explore options. The short answer is to have them reach out to us. The bare minimum on the syllabus is university policy but have them reach out to us for help.

Q: Regarding the process for moving the new website, are there any student representatives on the ATI side to help move the process along?

A: I don't know if there are any student representatives on the ATI side. I will take that back to the committee and bring it up.

Q: Is the new syllabus template in Canvas required to be used?

A: That is my understanding.

IX. New Business: None

X. State of the University Announcements:

A. Provost: No updates since last meeting.

Questions:

Q: Faculty can go into the CEP portal and access their data and you said in the last Senate meeting that there were resources for faculty that want to address that equity gap. What kinds of resources are available?

A: The CFD already has a number of courses in that area, but we are working on pulling together more content in that area. We are 1 out of 6 campuses piloting this portal right now.

Q: Back in September when we had our department faculty meeting, we were told that the university had discontinued scantron services. Were faculty notified ahead of time that this would be discontinued? What is the

university providing for the large classes that have been using this service routinely? Finally, the bookstore is still selling scantrons.

A: No. I had no idea. I don't know where that message came from and I've never seen it. I'd be happy to have you send it to me. I don't know who runs that service or who made that decision. I will look into this.

Q: We recently had a presentation from Ron Rogers on SJSU Online. Can you clarify whether students will be counted in department FTES for special sessions? Is there a reason for having SOTES on these classes, but not having students count in the FTES?

A: It is on a list of things that came up at the Chancellor's Office. In fact, right now we don't even count those students in GI 2025. There are a number of issues with this that have to do with the historical firewall we have created with this between self-support and state-support.

B. Associated Students President (AS):

Senator Treseler and I represented SJSU at Fresno State recently.

I will be doing evaluations on our Executive Officers.

AS President and Senator Chuang will sit on the Student Trustee Committee and is looking for questions she should ask the applicants.

AS has been having discussions around accessibility and ways they can improve it.

AS is looking into how they can improve student financial aid access and processes.

AS President and Senator Chuang had a great time attending "Homecoming" events. She also had a great time dancing.

AS held a picnic on the lawn of the AS House. Thanks to everyone that stopped by.

AS has awarded 89 scholarships worth \$91,500.

The graphics for our flyers encouraging students to join committees was finally approved, so you will see them up across campus soon.

Questions:

Q: Will AS help spread the word to get students to fill out SOTES?

A: I think the biggest problem is getting students to understand the importance of SOTES and what they are and do. The way to get the word out is by students talking to students and professors talking to their students about it. Last year I was in a class where a lot of students had concerns

about the professor. I told them to fill out the SOTES, but many didn't think it would really do anything. Students feel like they don't have a voice, even when it comes to voting for AS. They don't feel their vote will make a difference. It really comes back to prioritizing their voice in campus matters and giving feedback on what changes are made. We all need to do a better job communicating with students.

Q: Senator Chuang, I don't know if you remember when you and I sat on the PS Committee, and we started this conversation about drafting videos that talk about the importance of SOTES. We also talked about messages to go out to students about SOTES; one at the beginning, middle, and end of the semester. We put together a plan. I'm happy to discuss this with you.

A: Yes, I do remember our conversation. I'm happy to continue working on the videos.

C: [Chair McKee] I want to work with you on this. This is a large campus and it is easy to feel your voice isn't being heard, so whatever I can do to help you I will.

C: One concern faculty have about advocating for things in their classrooms is that students might feel they are being influenced.

C. Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF):

I spent lots of time speaking to you at the last meeting, so I will just take questions.

Questions:

Q: We are going to go to over 60% in-person classes next semester and we have lots of people on campus. When can we stop having to use these cards to get into the buildings?

A: I think we could put that to a vote and most of us would say we feel much safer having to use a card to get into a building. It is a good way to keep people that don't belong in our buildings out. We see the library and student union that have open access have more than their share of issues. I don't see this changing. We will continue to use cards.

Q: Couldn't this be an accessibility issue if we have someone that is having trouble getting from building-to-building having to fumble for a card?

A: I am happy to address any accessibility issues. We have added bars and special doors to make it more accessible. We are using our very limited deferred maintenance dollars to make it easier and more accessible across campus.

Q: I have concerns about the security of the data connected to the cards. Who has access to that data? Also, there is going to be an election tomorrow. There are concerns about the voting procedures. Are there any concerns about repercussions and/or increased security on campus?

A: We work very closely with the San José Police Department, the Sheriff's Office, etc. If we get any rumblings of marches or protests, we will address appropriately. Chief Carroll and his team will be here to address anything.

Q: We know there have been some improvements, but we are still seeing delays in payments to people. This affects our research and other key department initiatives. Are we addressing this?

A: Please send me an email detailing the issues. I'm not aware of any delays or concerns so if you send me an email, I will reach out to Joanne Wright or maybe it's the Research Foundation, etc. to get it right.

Q: A few weeks ago, I asked about what some of the university strategies to increase enrollment were. Any updates?

A: Thanks for the question. This is one of the biggest issues that we discuss in cabinet meetings. Just give us a little bit more time.

Q: I was wondering if impaction played any role in our decreased enrollment?

A: We will bring this back as a topic at another meeting.

D. Vice President of Student Affairs (VPSA):

We had a really good Homecoming Week. We are very proud of this campus, especially the leadership AS gave. I also want to thank the faculty that volunteered.

We have a number of funds coming to the university. First, we have GI 2025 dollars. We have money coming for foster care students, SB 24, and basic needs. We have been spending time planning the execution of the funds to support these programs. I'm happy to talk to anyone that wants more specific details.

Our Spartan Speaker Series is coming up. The next discussion will be on "Defending Tribal Rights."

As we start to look at fall enrollment, we are up in our frosh applications, but we are still down in our transfer applications. This is not a surprise. Our community colleges have not bounced back completely. International students are still a challenge. I want to remind people that we are not in competition with all the CSU. It is critical that we be able to connect with people before they get here.

We will be talking a lot more about New Student Orientation. We will be making some changes for the summer. There will be fewer sessions, but they will be larger. We want to engage students earlier.

Just an update from the Student Aid Commission. For those of you that don't know, that is the agency that provides Student Aid. Secondary schools are being asked to ensure that any graduating senior is filling out either a FAFSA

or a CADA. We have seen declines in FAFSA and CADA applications this year. Cal Grant reform continues to move forward.

Questions:

Q: According to the 2022 American College and Health Association a good percentage of students consider suicide. A survey of SJSU students showed 12% of SJSU students have considered suicide. How are we prepared, because we've already lost a few students?

A: First, I would include you as part of Student Affairs, given your role. Two, part of my priorities for this year in terms of what I take to the president and then engage the Wellness Center, particularly Dr. Fujimoto, is to have a broad scale strategy on how we are adjusting mentally. Specifically, what are some key metrics we want to achieve over time? This is not something you can solve with just one or two initiatives. We have to think about this quite broadly. What I've been told is that I need to bring forward a plan by the end of this semester that addresses mental health. There are a number of other dynamics that are affecting students as well. Part of the plan will address suicide, but also a whole range of mental health challenges. We need to have an approach that is institutional and not just one or two initiatives.

Q: I remember here on the Senate about 15 years ago there was an initiative for students to pay an additional fee to support more counseling services and this particular argument came up then. I'm wondering are students paying a fee for additional counseling services?

A: I don't know the timeline right off my head, but our Student Wellness Center is student fee funded. Part of what I anticipate in the plan Dr. Fujimoto is putting together are additional counselors. We anticipate we are going to have some legislation that requires us to meet certain ratios. We are also looking at where we can provide some additional opportunities and services. Our funds do support counselors. However, I can tell you that there are universities that have twice as many counselors as we do that don't have fewer challenges. We need to figure out a campus-wide plan.

Q: I like to let students know that they have already paid for counseling services when I encourage them to go there. Do we put any state funds into this or is it all student-supported?

A: I'll have to look at the books, but it is largely a student fee funded operation. This is not unusual. Most universities are funded this way.

Q: My question is about what I read in the Executive Committee minutes. You note that there is a reenrollment campaign, and there is a retention effort for juniors and seniors, etc. I would like to know what some of those efforts were? If they have been successful so far? You don't have to answer now, you can answer later.

A: I would be happy to come back to talk about this at another meeting.

E. Chief Diversity Officer: Not present.

F. CSU Faculty Trustee:

At the last Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting, the BOT submitted their budget request. At the November meeting next week, the most important item might be that the Chancellor's Office now recommends a fourth year of quantitative reasoning. This was a matter that was studied in 2015 by a taskforce with faculty members. Chancellor White, Lauren Blanchard, etc. were all in favor of this. They have started to study the pros and cons of instituting that additional requirement. Chancellor Castro put it on hold because of strong pushback from stakeholders from outside of the university who saw this as a barrier to access for minorities. We commissioned a study, but the study really didn't show us anything we didn't already know. Because of COVID and loosened requirements, we feel it is not the time to institute additional admission requirements.

We are currently looking for 5 presidents. That is for Sonoma State, Los Angeles, Chico, and Sacramento State. Also next week the BOT will determine who the new president of SJSU will be. We are also searching for the permanent Chancellor.

The Title IX investigation by Cozen-O'Connor is continuing. They have visited 15 campuses. They are visiting 3 more in November, 3 more in December, and 3 more in January, 2023. That's 24 campuses. They are looking at staffing and the structures of the Title IX Offices.

The Chancellor is very concerned about enrollment across the CSU. Our enrollment has dropped by 7%. There has been a significant drop in transfer students, because the Community Colleges had a big drop in attendance. There is a big gap in enrollment between the Northern campuses and the metropolitan campuses like Los Angeles. SJSU and Fresno are not as impacted by the enrollment as SFSU and Chico.

I'm announcing that I'm running for another term as Faculty Trustee, so thank you for your support.

[Senator Van Selst presented a motion to extend the meeting by 7 minutes. The motion was seconded and approved.]

G. Statewide Academic Senators:

[Senator Curry] Senator Curry announced that she had sent a written report out to all Senators.

There are some things that are redundant in our report. With respect to enrollment, the Chancellor has said that the CSU has an abundance of

interest from students in attending. The way that people look at college has changed, so our approach to enrollment must change.

The deadline for feedback on AS 3565 on Cal IGETC is near. What we know is there is an abundance of confusion on what is proposed. The kind of feedback received was from that perspective with some people believing it was the end of the campus GE program and it isn't. Keep on top of those reports and there is a new committee to work on AB 928 specifically.

We had 12 resolutions in second reading and all were approved. Some included discussions over enrollment, but also some of the things we raised today such as the pronoun changes, and how to arrive at equity. It is interesting that we talk a lot about equity, but it is hard to get there. Senator Van Selst provided the Dropbox link where you can see the resolutions that have passed. We have 8 resolutions that were first reads and they included lots of important topics like funding the Academic Senate work over the summer, especially legislative advocacy work in terms of reviewing all of the policies. There is a huge amount of work. Other resolutions coming up include support of the Native American Graves Act, timely response to resolutions from campus Senates, a housing survey, and lastly systemic racism names and pronouns.

We had a first reading of the resolution I brought on, "Women, Life, Freedom." I look forward to bringing it back in January 2023.

We will circulate the resolutions when available. However, we have provided the link where you can view these resolutions.

You have the right to provide feedback on these resolutions. We really need it. We will have our interim meeting on December 2, 2022.

XI. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

SJSU 2022-2023	ACADEMIC SENATE
12-05 2022	CONSENT CALENDAR

2022-2023	SENATE SEATS
-----------	--------------

ADD TO VACANT SEATS									
COMMITTEE TYPE	COMMITTEE NAME	SEAT	SEAT TITLE	NAME	ZIP	PHONE	TERM ENDS	CONSENT CALENDAR	FACULTY AT-LARGE
SPECIAL AGENCY	Campus Planning Board	P	Community	Robert Manford	robert.manford@sanjoseca.gov		2023	11/14	
OPERATING	General Education Advisory	C	Business --> FAL	Souvick Ghosh	0070	43417	2023 --> 2023	12/05	FAL
OPERATING	Graduate Studies & Research	J	Humanities & Arts --> FAL	Vishnu Pendyala	0135	42729	2025 --> 2023	12/05	FAL
OPERATING	Graduate Studies & Research	1	Student-Graduate Student	Akash Amin			2023	12/05	
OPERATING	Program Planning	2	Student-Undergraduate Student	Shreya Shah	0128	46242	2023	12/05	
OPERATING	Student Fairness	3	Student	Yu Hsi (Emmy) Shih	2022	46242	2023	11/14	
OPERATING	Student Fairness	4	Student	Akash Amin	0128	46242	2023	12/05	
OPERATING	Student Fairness	5	Student	Sunjay Raman	0128	46242	2023	12/05	
OPERATING	Student Fairness	6	Student	Sarah Das	0128	46242	2023	12/05	
OPERATING	Student Fairness	7	Student	Subhadra Ranga Swamy Yella	0128	46242	2023	12/05	
OPERATING	Undergraduate Studies	F	General Unit --> FAL	Anthony Chow	0029	42490	2023 --> 2023	12/05	FAL
OPERATING	Undergraduate Studies	H	Science --> FAL	Shu Zhou	0164	43571	2025 --> 2023	12/05	FAL
OPERATING	Undergraduate Studies	2	Student	Sunjay Raman			2023	12/05	
SPECIAL AGENCY	Strategic Planning Steering	F	Student-Graduate Student	Subhadra Ranga Swamy Yella	0128	46244	2023	12/05	
SPECIAL AGENCY	Student Success	G	Student-Graduate/Undergraduate Student	Shreya Shah			2023	12/05	
OTHER	Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility	A	Health & Human Sciences	Ashwini Wagle	0058	43110	2026	11/21	
OTHER	Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility	C	Education	Brent Duckor	0074	43775	2026	11/21	
OTHER	Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility	D	Engineering	Laura Sullivan Green	0083	43906	2025	11/21	
OTHER	Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility	E	Humanities & Arts	Shannon Rose Riley	0092	41365	2024	11/21	
OTHER	Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility	H	General Unit	Anthony Chow	0029	42496	2024	11/21	
OTHER	Transit/Traffic & Parking	I	Campus Neighborhood	Ramses Madou	ramses.madou@sanjoseca.gov		2024	12/05	
OTHER	University Writing Committee	I	Faculty University Library	Peggy Cabrera	0028	82034	2025	12/05	
OTHER	University Writing Committee	S	Student Graduate Student	Sarah Das	0128		2023	12/05	

REMOVE FROM SEATS									
COMMITTEE TYPE	COMMITTEE NAME	SEAT	SEAT TITLE	NAME	ZIP	PHONE	TERM ENDS	CONSENT CAL	FACULTY AT-LARGE
OPERATING	General Education Advisory	H	Science --> FAL	Shu Zhou	0164	43571	2025	12/05	FAL

OPERATING	General Education Advisory	L	Faculty-at-Large 3	Ruma Chopra	0117	45515	2023	12/05	
-----------	----------------------------	---	--------------------	-------------	------	-------	------	-------	--

Executive Committee Minutes
October 31, 2022
12 - 1:30 p.m. via Zoom

Present: Alison McKee (Chair), Priya Raman, Karthika Sasikumar, Reiko Kataoka, Laura Sullivan-Green, Steve Perez, Charlie Faas, Marie Haverfield, Julia Curry, Nina Chuang, Patrick Day, Rachael French, Tabitha Hart

Absent: Vincent Del Casino, Kathy Wong(Lau)

Recorder: Eva Joice, Senate Administrator

1. The committee approved the consent agenda (Executive Committee Agenda of October 31, 2022, Consent Calendar of October 31, 2022, Executive Committee Minutes of October 3, 2022, Executive Committee Minutes of October 17) (11-0-0).

2. Update from the Interim President:

I appreciated the moment of silence for Camdan McWright at the last Senate meeting. The family felt very loved and supported by the SJSU community after all the outreach.

AS President Chuang, VP Day and I attended a spectacular celebration Sunday night. Hundreds of people danced, clapped and banged sticks in celebration of the goddess, Durga, at "Raas Garba" Saturday night, hosted by the Indian Student Organization.

We put out a call for faculty volunteers to serve on Bob Lim's review committee and only received one volunteer. We need two additional faculty. Chair McKee will put out an email to the faculty listserv.

Questions:

Q: Are you looking for faculty that are related to information technology for Bob Lim's review committee?

A: Not necessarily. A broad range of people is good.

Q: We have been working on recruitment for Senate committees.

3. Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR):

It has been a perennial problem to staff the BAFPR with full-time tenured full professors and there is currently an urgent issue that requires its adjudication.

Questions:

C: I don't believe people don't want to serve. The problem is many departments don't have many full professors and this makes it very difficult. We should be actively recruiting people for the Senate and Senate service in an ongoing way.

4. University Updates:

a. VPSA:

Thanks to everyone that helped with Homecoming Week. I would like to acknowledge AS and their hard work. It was a great week after a not-so-great week. The interim president was there for Fire on the Fountain. If you have never seen our AS President fly through the air dancing, you really need to.

Just a reminder about our Spartan Speaker Series and the next event on November 16, 2022 at 6 p.m. with Tara Houska speaking on “Defending Tribal Land and Indigenous Acts.”

b. AS President:

AS is reaching out to ask for support for the Emergency Contact Fund.

Thank you to everyone that came to the picnic. We had a guest appearance by the SJSU Duck.

There are certain departmental policies that restrict international students from serving on committees. It is important we decrease barriers to access. Please review your departmental policies.

The Nihomachi Outreach Committee is planning a Day of Remembrance for former internees from Japantown. The official day of remembrance is Sunday, February 19, 2023. We will be having a campus-wide event on February 16, 2023. AS President Chuang has been talking with alumni in Japantown. Many students are unaware of Executive Order 9066 unless they take Asian Studies classes. We need to be involved.

Questions:

Q: Can you send us a calendar of events? Please reach out if you need faculty help.

A: We are planning campus events right now and will try to get all the details worked out. We are planning around Asian Studies events.

c. CSU Statewide:

The ASCSU is meeting this week Wednesday through Friday. Some Senators expressed concern about having virtual ASCSU meetings when they are having to teach face-to-face.

The CEP team is asking for us to send a message to our faculty encouraging them to use the portal to do the survey.

There is a resolution coming forward that opposes AB 928.

C: Maybe SJSU should do a Sense of the Senate Resolution. Different campuses have objected to different things.

5. Policy Committee Updates:

a. From the Professional Standards Committee (PS):

There are two amendments that PS is bringing to the Senate, an amendment to F12-6 and an amendment to F17-3. PS will also be reviewing some minor program changes for clarity purposes.

- b. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
O&G will be bringing the Senate Management Resolution on Modality for a final reading. O&G is also working on a referral regarding the Faculty Athletics Representative's term (FAR). A third item O&G is working on is connected to a Sense of the Senate passed in Fall 2020 Condemning Anti Black Racism, SS-F20-2. O&G has been asked to follow up on two of the clauses.
- c. From the Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
C&R is working on an amendment to eliminate the WST. C&R is discussing the feedback from the last Senate meeting on S16-17, Academic Certificate Programs. C&R is also working on the Geographic Information Science BS proposal and Sociology, Social Interaction Concentration discontinuation proposal.
- d. From the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
I&SA will be bringing AS 1834 and AS 1835 for final readings to the next Senate meeting. I&SA may bring changes to the Excused Absence Policy.

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

The minutes were edited by Chair McKee on November 17, 2022.
The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on November 21, 2022.

7 **Policy Recommendation**
8 **Amendment D to University Policy F12-6**
9 **Evaluation in Effectiveness in Teaching for all Faculty**

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

Legislative History: This proposal would amend the policy on evaluation in effectiveness in teaching for all faculty.

Rationale: The CSU/CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement that went into effect on February 3, 2022 includes a provision allowing faculty to submit written rebuttals to student course evaluations, but it is not clear how well-known this provision is. It is important that this right be communicated in policy.

In addition, while F12-6 currently provides for the exclusion of SOTEs completed by students who earn a grade of “WU,” SOTEs completed by students who formally withdraw from a class, as well as students who audited a class, are still included. However, students who withdrew from a class may not have attended enough of the class to be able to provide accurate feedback. Finally, the SOTE/SOLATE instruments ask questions about grading fairness and other aspects of a class that do not apply to students who audit courses, again impacting the accuracy of the provided feedback.

Resolved That sections E.4, E.5, and E.9 of F12-6 (Evaluation in Effectiveness in Teaching for all Faculty) be modified as follows:

- 32 4. Other than those classes excluded in E3 (above), SOTES shall be administered in
33 all classes with enrollments of 5 or more students. In courses with enrollments of
34 5-9 students, faculty may choose that SOTES not be administered in the course.
35 Results of SOTE evaluations will be placed in the faculty personnel file. Faculty may
36 submit a written rebuttal to be included in the faculty personnel file with a class’s SOTES
37 when they believe that additional information is needed or that there are student biases
38 (as per the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 15). Rebuttals shall be sent to the
39 Faculty Services office within 10 academic year duty days following the release of official
40 SOTES. Faculty may choose to exclude the survey results from one course per
41 year from their periodic evaluations, provided that they teach at least fifteen WTUs
42 (equivalent of five typical three unit courses in either regular and/or special
43 sessions) evaluated via the SOTE instrument during that year. (Issues in
44 interpreting the 15 WTU requirement shall be resolved by the Provost or
45 designee.) For this purpose, the “year” shall correspond to the review cycle of the
46 faculty member; i.e., for tenured/tenure-track faculty beginning in Fall; for lecturer
47 faculty beginning in Spring. When the periodic review covers multiple years, only

48 one course in any year may be excluded, and the remaining SOTES shall be
49 representative of the teaching assignment. **In consultation with the Professional**
50 **Standards Committee, Faculty Services will develop a process for exclusion and**
51 **rebuttal of SOTEs and issue guidelines and a calendar describing that process.**

52 5. When SOTES are included in a periodic evaluation, both the quantitative scores
53 and the associated qualitative comments will be included **(as will any rebuttal)**. When
54 SOTES are excluded from a periodic evaluation, both the quantitative scores and
55 the associated qualitative comments will be excluded **(as will any rebuttal)**.

56

57 9. ~~If technically feasible,~~ sSurveys from students earning the grades “W, WU, and
58 AU” are to be excluded from results.

59

60

61 Approved: November 21, 2022

62 Vote: 7-0-0

63 Present: French, Gómez, Kazemifar, Monday, Rapanot, Smith, Wang

64 Absent: Barrera

65

66 Financial Impact: None

67 Workload Impact: Some additional work to implement CBA 15.7 (c) on the part of
68 UP/FS

69

1 **SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Curriculum and Research Committee**
4 **December 5, 2022**
5 **Final Reading**

AS 1836

6
7 **Amendment A to University Policy S16-17**
8 **Academic Certificate Programs: Review and Approval**
9 **Process**

10

11 **Rationale:**

12 University Policy S16-17 defines the review and approval process for academic
13 certificate programs. This amendment updates reporting and oversight roles to match
14 current university structures and adds language intended to better define basic and
15 advanced certificates, provides safeguards for students stacking certificates to
16 complete a master's degree, clarifies double counting of courses for more than one
17 certificate, defines expiration of courses for certificates, and corrects an error in the
18 description of grade averaging.

19

20

21 **Resolved:** That the following amendments be adopted; and be it further

22

23 **Resolved:** That all certificate programs at San José State University must be reviewed
24 and approved under the process outlined in the attached guidelines; and be it further

25

26 **Resolved:** That only certificates from approved academic certificate programs can be
27 awarded and posted on transcripts.

28

29 **Approved (C&R):** 11/14/2022

30

31 **Vote:** 10-0-0

32

33 **Present:** Thalia Anagnos (seat B), Marc d'Alarcao (seat C), Megan
34 Chang (seat D), Hiu Yung Wong (seat G), Wei-Chien Lee
35 (seat H), Stefan Frazier (seat I), Scott Shaffer (seat J),
36 Marie Haverfield (seat K, chair), Ellen Middaugh (Faculty-
37 at-Large), Colin Onita (seat E)

38

39 **Absent:** Safiullah Saif (seat L), Richard Mocarski (seat A)

40

41 **Financial Impact:** None anticipated

42

43 **Workload Impact:** None anticipated

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

Certificate Guidelines

Types of Certificate Programs

- 1) Certificate programs are defined as any program in which some form of recognition from San José State University is awarded to participants. Two basic kinds **general categories** of certificate programs **exist**, Academic and Other (defined below) but only the former is the subject of this policy.

- 2) Academic certificate programs
 - a) **Definition:** Certificate programs are classified as “Academic” if students receive academic credit for any courses in the program.
 - b) Types of Academic certificate programs
 - i) Basic (undergraduate level)
 - (1) **Definition:** A basic certificate program provides opportunities for students to pursue specialized, often pre-professional, focused educational objectives that may be separate from a degree program.
 - (2) **Jurisdiction:** Basic certificate programs (**stateside and self-support**) are under the jurisdiction of the Undergraduate Studies (UGS) Committee and administered by the Office of Graduate and Undergraduate **Education (UE)**.
 - ii) Advanced (graduate level)
 - (1) **Definition:** An advanced certificate program offers post-baccalaureate students coursework leading to a specific, applied, focused goal.
 - (2) **Jurisdiction:** Advanced certificate programs (**stateside and self-support**) are under the jurisdiction of the Graduate Studies and Research (GS&R) Committee and administered by **the College of Graduate Studies (CGS)**.

- 3) Other certificate programs
 - a) **Definition:** Certificate programs are classified as “Other” if no academic credit or grade is required to be awarded for completion of courses in the program. **Professional development units are not considered academic credit.**
 - b) **Jurisdiction:** College of **Professional and Global Education International and Extended Studies (CPGE)** oversees these certificates ~~in consultation with the AVP of GUP.~~

85

86

General Guidelines for Academic Certificate Programs

87

88 ~~1) Self-supporting certificate programs, both basic and advanced, credit and non-~~
89 ~~credit, will be administered by CIES, but curricular reviews will be conducted~~
90 ~~through normal curricular review processes and overseen by GUP.~~

91 2) **Academic** State support certificate programs must be credit bearing and must
92 go through the curricular review process overseen by **the University Curriculum**
93 **Office**.

94 3) Academic certificate programs should establish at least one advisor or director
95 to oversee certificate programs within the unit.

96 ~~4) Certificate programs that are classifiable as “Academic” that do not meet the~~
97 ~~criteria for this policy must be discontinued or go through a review process prior~~
98 ~~to Fall 2018.~~

99 5) **All academic certificates must be conferred by the University and not by an**
100 **individual department or program. University oversight includes listing in the**
101 **catalog, evaluation and record of completion, and issuance of the certificate of**
102 **completion.**

103

104

Specific to Academic Basic Certificate Programs

105

Requirements

107 1) Basic certificate programs must include a minimum of 9 units and maximum of
108 18 units of coursework. Programs may require that all prerequisite coursework
109 has been completed prior to enrolling in the basic certificate program. At least 6
110 units must be completed at SJSU. **At least 50% of coursework counted toward**
111 **the certificate must be graded.**

112 2) Basic certificate programs may include lower-division and upper-division
113 courses numbered 1 through 199 ~~(excluding individual studies, directed~~
114 ~~reading, supervision, and credit/no-credit courses).~~

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

117 4) Basic certificates are available to matriculated students (regular or special
118 session status).

119 5) Generally, a maximum of 33% of basic certificate units (e.g., 3 units for a 9-unit
120 certificate) can be completed **in non-matriculated status** ~~through Open University~~
121 at SJSU with approval from the department or school. In some cases, a basic
122 certificate may be completed entirely through Open University if the student has
123 completed a Bachelor’s degree and received approval from the department or
124 school.

125 6) Unless otherwise stated in the catalog, courses taken as part of an SJSU Academic
126 Certificate program can be applied to an approved major, minor, or emphasis
127 program ~~where one is required for the student’s degree~~ **subject to SJSU policies.**

128 Unless otherwise stated in the catalog, courses taken for a major or minor may be
129 applied to a basic certificate program upon approval from the basic certificate
130 program advisor/director.

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

135 8) The advisor/director of the program is responsible for verifying a student's
136 satisfactory completion of the academic requirements established for the program
137 and for forwarding a copy of the certificate completion form to the Office of the
138 Registrar. The Office of the Registrar records the completion of the program on
139 the student's transcript.
140

141 Specific to Academic Advanced Certificate Programs

142 Requirements

143
144 1) Advanced certificate programs must include a minimum of 9 units and maximum
145 of 18 units of coursework. **At least 50% of coursework counted toward the**
146 **certificate must be graded.**

147 2) Advanced certificate programs must **consist** of courses numbered 100 through 299
148 **and/or 500-599** (~~excluding individual studies, directed reading, supervision, and~~
149 ~~credit/no-credit courses~~), with at least 3 units of coursework numbered 200 or
150 higher.

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

153 4) With the approval of the department or school, units may be applied to both an
154 advanced certificate program and a graduate degree program offered by the
155 department. **A maximum of 3 units of coursework may be applied to two different**
156 **advanced certificates as long as there are at least 9 unique units in each certificate.**

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

159 a) Students must maintain a minimum GPA of 3.0 in all advanced certificate
160 coursework, with no less than the grade of "C" in any course. A maximum of
161 4 units of coursework with a grade of "C" can **be applied** toward an advanced
162 certificate.

163 b) A maximum of 4 units of coursework may be repeated. **If a course is**
164 **repeated, grade points and units from all attempts shall be included in the**
165 **calculation of the student's SJSU cumulative GPA and overall GPA, as**
166 **described in F08-2.** ~~The grade used for the GPA for the advanced certificate~~
167 ~~is the average of the initial grade and the grade upon repeating the course.~~

168 c) **Generally, a maximum of 33% of advanced certificate units (e.g., 3 units for a**
169 **9-unit certificate) can be completed in non-matriculated status at SJSU with**
170 **approval from the department or school. In some cases, an advanced**
171 **certificate may be completed entirely in non-matriculated status if the student**

- 172 has received approval from the department or school and the Associate Dean
173 of Graduate Programs in the College of Graduate Studies. Advanced
174 certificates may be available to matriculated (regular or special session
175 status) and non-matriculated students (i.e., taken through Open University).
- 176 d) A maximum of 30% of any graduate degree program units (e.g., 9 units for a
177 30-unit Master's degree) can be completed from another institution or units
178 from Open University (including advanced certificate courses) at SJSU with
179 approval from the department or school.
 - 180 e) The choice of grading requirements may have implications for transferability
181 to degree programs.
- 182 6) These guidelines constitute minimum standards for advanced certificate
183 programs; departments may propose additional requirements for approval by the
184 GS&R Committee.
185
- 186 7) Departments/programs offering advanced certificate programs must have their
187 advanced certificate students complete an intake form and submit an official
188 transcript(s) (noting the completion of a U.S. bachelor's degree from an accredited
189 institution or the equivalent of a U.S. bachelor's degree from an accredited and/or
190 recognized institution from a foreign country). Students must have an undergraduate
191 GPA of at least 2.5 (where A=4). A department or program can propose more
192 restrictive requirements subject to approval by the GS&R committee.
- 193 a) Non-matriculated students who complete an advanced certificate program
194 solely through Open University are required to send copies of this
195 documentation to CPGE wherein this information will be retained and tracked
196 by CPGE. Matriculated advanced certificate students that go through a formal
197 university admissions review will have the said documentation retained and
198 tracked at the Graduate Admissions and Program Evaluations (GAPE) office
199 within CGS.
 - 200 b) Departments/programs offering advanced certificate programs may specify
201 subject matter and/or coursework prerequisites for entrance into the certificate
202 program. Such prerequisites must be listed in the university catalog.
203 Prerequisite courses or equivalent experience must demonstrate current and
204 appropriate preparation as determined by the program. All other grading
205 regulations of the graduate school apply to the courses in the certificate
206 programs (e.g., the prohibition against taking graded classes pass/fail).
 - 207 c) Where appropriate, some form of portfolio presentation, performance audition,
208 or other evidence of specific competence may be required by departments.
209 Such criteria will also be listed in the catalog.
- 210 8) The advisor/director of the certificate program is responsible for verifying
211 information in the student's intake form and the student's satisfactory completion
212 of the academic requirements established for the program and for forwarding the
213 certificate completion form to GAPE. After a review and evaluation, GAPE then
214 records the completion of the program onto the student's transcript.
- 215 9) Courses taken in the advanced certificate program expire 7 years from the point of
216 grade posting. A maximum of 3 units may be revalidated in accordance with S17-7,
217 if permitted by department or program policy, for an advanced certificate program.

218 The student must have earned at least a “B” grade in a course to revalidate it. The
219 department that offered the class must administer an assessment of the student’s
220 knowledge. The assessment could be an oral exam, written exam, research paper,
221 or of any other kind of format approved by the department. The assessment must be
222 evaluated by the faculty member who taught the original course, by one who has
223 taught the course at another time, or by one who has reasonable knowledge of the
224 course content. Note that any course(s) that may be applied to a graduate degree
225 program are also subject to expiration 7 years from the date of original grade
226 posting.
227

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

- 229
- 230 1) All courses in a certificate program must undergo the normal course approval
 - 231 process prior to approval of the certificate course package.
 - 232 2) Proposal Content:
 - 233 a) SJSU College Dean Curricular Proposal Approval Form(s).
 - 234 b) Brief statement of purpose.
 - 235 c) Clearly stated learning outcomes mapped to coursework.
 - 236 d) Catalog copy, which includes the following:
 - 237 i. Brief statement of purpose.
 - 238 ii. Admissions requirements.
 - 239 iii. Course requirements.
 - 240 iv. Any prerequisites for the certificate program.
 - 241 v. Total number of units.
 - 242 e) GPA needed to **earn** the certificate if other than a minimum of 2.0 for basic
 - 243 certificates and 3.0 for advanced certificates.
 - 244 f) Program advisor.
 - 245 g) For advanced certificates: number of units applicable (if any) to a degree
 - 246 and/or major depending upon matriculation status (with the caveat that the
 - 247 units may not be uniformly applied but require advisor consent).
 - 248 h) For advanced certificates: if students are allowed to complete certificate
 - 249 courses through Open University, then the department/program must provide
 - 250 a justification for this pathway. The justification establishes that sufficient
 - 251 space will be available in the courses required for the certificate program.
 - 252 i. This justification must comply with Executive Order #1099 which allows
 - 253 OU enrollment in state-supported courses on a space available basis
 - 254 after enrollment opportunities have been provided to state-support
 - 255 matriculated students.
 - 256 ii. The justification must also comply with Executive Order #805 which
 - 257 states “enrollment or potential enrollment of non-matriculated students
 - 258 in state supported courses shall not be the basis of the addition for a
 - 259 course that would otherwise be canceled because of low enrollment of
 - 260 regular matriculated students”.
 - 261 iii. Departments/programs must go through a recertification process every

262 five years that re-evaluates the justification for certificate completion
263 through Open University. These recertification requests will need
264 approval by the college deans, the Chair of GS&R, and the Provost.
265 **CGS** will oversee this recertification process.

266 3) Submission process

- 267 a) Academic certificate programs (either basic or advanced) may be proposed by
268 department, school or college curriculum committees.
269 b) Proposals may be submitted, reviewed, and approved at any time during the
270 academic year.
271 c) For entry into the catalog, the approval must be registered with **the University**
272 **Curriculum Office** according to published catalog deadlines.

273 4) Review process for new proposals

274 The reviewing bodies are responsible for timely review and approval of academic
275 certificate programs:

- 276 a) Proposals from either department or college level curriculum committees are
277 submitted to the appropriate department chair(s) or school director(s) for
278 review.
279 b) Upon approval, the department or school reviews are then submitted with a
280 copy of the proposal to the appropriate curriculum committee(s) and college
281 dean(s) for review and approval.
282 c) Upon approval of the college deans, a copy of the proposal (along with
283 reviews from departmental/school and deans) is submitted to the Chair of the
284 appropriate operating committee.
285 i. If the program contains any 200 level courses, the materials are
286 referred to the Chair of the GS&R Committee for review.
287 ii. If the program does not contain any 200 level courses, the materials
288 are referred to the Chair of the UGS Committee for review.
289 iii. During duty days, within one week, the committee Chair will determine
290 if the Committee needs to review the proposal. If no full committee
291 review is required, the proposal and accompanying reviews are
292 submitted to the Provost via the **University Curriculum Office**
293 ~~appropriate office (GS&R for programs with 200 level courses or UGS~~
294 ~~for proposals with 100 level programs)~~ with a statement from the Chair
295 specifying that a review from their committee was not necessary.
296 d) If review by the appropriate operating committee is necessary, the Chair of the
297 operating committee will send recommendations from the committees, along
298 with the proposal and accompanying reviews, to the Provost via the **University**
299 **Curriculum Office** ~~(GS&R for programs with 200 level courses or UGS for~~
300 ~~proposals with 100 level programs).~~
301 e) The Provost makes the final decision on whether or not to approve the
302 certificate program.

303 5) Review process for existing certificate programs

- 304 a) Substitution, deletion, or addition of courses to the program will need to go
305 through the minor program change process in the **University Curriculum**
306 **Office**.

307
308
309
310

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

SENATE MANAGEMENT RESOLUTION

Update to the Standing Rules of the Academic Senate

Rationale

In Spring 2020 the Academic Senate temporarily suspended Item 17 section g of the Standing Rules due to the global COVID-19 pandemic. This part of the Standing Rules predetermines modality for all Senate meetings; mandates in-person meetings; prohibits remote meetings for any full Senate or Executive Committee meetings; and limits remote meeting attendance of policy committees and all other Senate committees to only “rare” circumstances, while simultaneously placing the burden of any accommodation on the individual requesting it.

As they are currently written, the Senate’s Standing Rules provide little flexibility on the modality of its meetings. Further, by withholding any decision-making about meeting modality from the Senators who actually participate in them, the Standing Rules run counter to shared governance, where decision-making ought to be collaborative, consultative, and distributed¹.

Meeting modality impacts access and participation in complex ways, and each type will necessarily pose affordances as well as constraints. Rather than predetermining the modality of all its meetings into the indefinite future, the Senate would benefit from a more flexible, adaptable, and inclusive approach, one which gives Senators a voice and vote in deciding what meeting modality will best serve them in the unique circumstances of their times.

Now, as we enter more fully into post-pandemic operations, we have an opportune moment to adapt the Senate’s approach to meeting modality in a way that will better empower its current and future members. In this spirit, we therefore recommend that Item 17 Section g of the Standing Rules be updated and that the updates contained herein be adopted once passed by the Senate.

¹ See [SS-S15-6](#), a sense of the Senate resolution titled “Endorsing the Statement on Shared Governance at San José State University.”

Senate Management Resolution

Recommended Updates to Senate Standing Rules

Item 17 **Committee** Meetings and Minutes, Section g **Remote** Attendance

1) **Full Academic Senate:**

The modality of the full Academic Senate meetings (i.e., meetings convening the entire membership of the Academic Senate) shall be decided by the Senate's current members through ranked choice voting on these three modalities: in person; online; and hybrid, defined here as a simultaneous combination of modalities, whereby some members attend in person while some members attend synchronously online. The ranked choice vote shall be conducted sometime shortly after the first meeting of the new Academic Senate year in May, using an electronic survey instrument. The outcome of members' votes shall be determined as per the guidelines for ranked choice vote tabulation².

Additionally, the Senate should enable all interested members of the SJSU community to follow the proceedings of full Academic Senate meetings in real time. This access can be provided through a sufficient number of physical seats in the meeting room and also by telephone or internet enabled audio or video conferencing or other technological means, with the understanding that observer attendance may require pre-registration and/or some other form of RSVP.

2) **Executive Committee of the Senate:**

The modality of the Executive Committee of the Senate shall be decided by that committee's current members through ranked choice voting on these three modalities: in person; online; and hybrid, defined here as a simultaneous combination of modalities, whereby some members attend in person while some members attend synchronously online. The ranked choice vote shall be conducted using an electronic survey instrument sometime after the first meeting of the new Academic Senate year in May, and shall be timed to adequately capture the votes of the new cohort. The outcome of cohort members' votes shall be determined as per the guidelines for ranked choice vote tabulation.

² See the RCV Tabulator provided by the Ranked Choice Voting Resource Center at <https://www.rcvresources.org/rctab>

3) **Senate Policy Committees:**

The modality of each Senate Policy Committee shall be decided by each committee's current members through ranked choice voting on these three modalities: in person; online; and hybrid, defined here as a simultaneous combination of modalities, whereby some members attend in person while some members attend synchronously online. The ranked choice vote shall be conducted using an electronic survey instrument sometime after the first meeting of the new Academic Senate year in May, and shall be timed to adequately capture the votes of the new cohort. The outcome of cohort members' votes shall be determined as per the guidelines for ranked choice vote tabulation.

4) **Other Senate Committees:**

The modality of other Senate Committees shall be decided by each committee's current members through ranked choice voting on these three modalities: in person; online; and hybrid, defined here as a simultaneous combination of modalities, whereby some members attend in person while some members attend synchronously online. The ranked choice vote shall be conducted using an electronic survey instrument sometime after the first meeting of the new Academic Senate year in May, and shall be timed to adequately capture the votes of the new cohort. The outcome of cohort members' votes shall be determined as per the guidelines for ranked choice vote tabulation.

Approved: November 28, 2022

Vote: 10-0-0

Present: Andreopoulos, Baur, Han, Hart, Herrlin, Higgins, Jochim, Muñoz-Muñoz, Tan, Tian

Absent: Lee

Financial impact:

Regardless of modality, the Senate will continue to require equipment (laptops, projectors, displays, microphones, cameras, etc.), and technologies (reliable Internet access; software/platforms for synchronous document creation, such as Google Docs; software/platforms for presentations, such as Google Slides or PowerPoint) to successfully run its meetings.

Ideally, the University will also invest in a hybrid meeting space for full Senate meetings. As the campus considers the new Campus Master Plan, it should consider the technological needs to support hybrid modalities for instruction and meetings.

Workload impact:

Regardless of modality, the work of organizing, running, and actively participating in Senate meetings is considerable. For all of this important work, the Senate as a whole as well as individual Senators have always needed and will continue to need ongoing training, resources, and support to run their meetings.

If this SMR is adopted, there may be an impact on the workload of running Senate meetings. As experienced during the pandemic, when SJSU's Academic Senate switched to online-only meetings via Zoom, transitional periods can increase workload as members familiarize themselves with and develop their competencies in new processes, tools, and protocols. This happens to some extent regardless of meeting modality, as members take on different roles and responsibilities in the Senate, and it also happens when newer and/or additional tools or technologies are introduced and integrated into meetings.

Depending on the size and complexity of the meeting, we anticipate that the Senate will benefit from having multiple people involved in running its meetings, especially when it comes to scheduling; tracking attendance; facilitating discussion, debate, and deliberation; managing the speaker's list; voting; troubleshooting; and note-taking. While this is the case regardless of modality, it is especially true when it comes to transitioning from one modality to another, and to meetings into which newer and/or additional tools or technologies are introduced and integrated.

Technological resources (e.g., voting software, attendance, transcription of recordings) should also be considered as a means of alleviating workload impact on Senate personnel.

In short, while the labor required to successfully run the Senate's meetings may ebb and flow depending on members' experiences, circumstances, and conditions, it will never be eliminated.

Finally, the electronic survey instrument will need to be developed and updated as appropriate. It will need to be run once per academic year; the resulting ranked choice votes will need to be tabulated.

Examples of successful hybrid meetings at SJSU

Summary (in table format)

Unit	Locations	Meeting activities	Attendance	Equipment	Support	Rationale
Center for Faculty Development (CFD) & eCampus	IRC 202, Student Union, WSQ 205, BBC 32, ENG 285/287, SSC 500, MLK 225 (YUH 124)	Presentations; small & large group discussions; Q&A; cloud document creation; reflection activities	30-65 in the room 20-30 via Zoom	laptops, OWL, microphones, connectors, wifi, cloud-based slides and docs (Google Drive), smart phones, earbuds or headsets	multiple members run the meetings, with additional support by tech teams depending on the room	<p>Inclusivity for faculty who are 100% remote and for faculty (such as lecturers) who have heavy teaching loads and less flexibility with time.</p> <p>Increase opportunities for professional development.</p> <p>Support faculty who are doing caregiving (e.g., elder or childcare).</p> <p>Facilitate recording and transcription of events, captioning and accessibility</p> <p>Can be an effective modality for some learners' needs, speaker's strengths, planned activities, and contextual factors.</p>
Institutional Research and Strategic Analytics	Provost's Conference Room (Clark Hall 412)	Presentations; discussion; Q&A; deliberation; decision making; document drafting; voting	10 to 40 in the room 5 to 30 via Zoom	laptop, projector, 1 pull-down screen, OWL camera	one trained staff person	<p>Facilitates access for those who are off campus.</p> <p>Accommodate people who want to meet in person and those can only join via Zoom.</p> <p>Increase attendance for meetings that traditionally have fewer participants.</p>

Unit	Locations	Meeting activities	Attendance	Equipment	Support	Rationale
						Considering varying teaching and on/off campus schedules, a hybrid modality creates more equitable opportunities for participation and ensures all voices can be heard.
COMM Dept	MLK 225	Presentations, speeches, sharing of still images and recorded music	17 in the room 17 on Zoom	laptop, projector, 1 pull-down screen, podium, microphone	Two student assistants assigned by library; two departmental members facilitating in the room, plus one facilitating on Zoom	Accommodate participants who, given ongoing pandemic concerns, would be reluctant or unable to attend in person.
COMM Graduate Committee	HGH, Marie Carr conference room	Presentations; discussion; Q&A; deliberation; decision making; document drafting; voting	up to 10 in the room no limit via Zoom	laptops, wifi	none	Everyone is already familiar with Zoom. Accessible Enables visibility without having to use additional equipment Provides captions regardless of who is speaking (in-person vs. online).
Student Union AV & Event Services Department	Student Union	presentations Q&A, discussion	50-100 in the room 5-20 via Zoom	OWL or Logitech conference camera with mic; laptop; Google Drive; switcher; projector with speakers; adaptors; cables	Audio, lighting, & video techs; camera & zoom tech, setup and tear down crew.	It allows those who are still hesitant in being around a lot of people the option to attend events at the comfort of their devices. It gives attendees who are not comfortable with being back in-person yet an opportunity to still be part of the event.

Examples of successful hybrid meetings at SJSU (full answers)

Center for Faculty Development and eCampus

Submitted by

Dr. Deanna Fassett, Assistant Vice Provost for Faculty Development

Location

Various. IRC 202 is not yet fully renovated, and can only accommodate approximately 36 in the room.

For larger meetings such as Jump Start Common Convenings, we've tried a number of spaces on campus, including Student Union, WSQ 205, BBC 32, ENG 285/287, SSC 500, and MLK 225.

Facilitated by

MLK is the best at co-synchronous meetings that we've found. Their IT support sets up two cameras (one aimed at the speaker and the other aimed at the audience) and answers questions about the in-room features. For a meeting like that, I facilitate the interaction in the room, and it's wise to have someone keeping an eye on the Zoom.

BBC 32 is similarly "turnkey."

ENG 285/287 has had a lot of tech issues, including most recently a faulty projection system. I'm not sure where they are on resolving those issues. When things are working there, they work well enough.

For rooms like ENG 285/287, SSC 500, and the Student Union, we bring our homegrown remote kit, which includes a laptop, OWL camera, slide advancer, microphone, and collection of various connectors. Two staff members arrive in advance of the meeting--one typically handles catering and room arrangement and the other sets up the OWL, tests the tech, opens the Zoom and projects the slides.

For meetings where I have guest speakers, I'm the one keeping an eye on the Zoom. When I'm the presenter, I ask someone to keep an eye on the Zoom (this could be any number of people--e.g., faculty member who assumes responsibility, another colleague who has an interest in the Jump Start topic of the day, a staff member, or a student who has very clear instructions.)

Type of communication in the meetings

Presentations by speakers both in person and via zoom; small and large group discussions; Q&A; cloud document creation/annotation (e.g., Jamboard, Docs, Slides, Poll Everywhere), individual reflection activities.

Attendance

This varies depending on Jump Start vs, say, LEAD (chairs & directors), but it's usually about half in the room and half in the Zoom.

For our most recent Jump Start convening, we were about 30 in the room and 20 in Zoom.

For the hybrid course prep marathon we ran in WSQ 205 in August, we had 65 or so in the room and another 15-30 in the Zoom. That room is tiered, which is kind of tough for small group conversations, but for a lecture-style seating arrangement, it's set up well and includes a broad array of "turnkey" hyflex features, including lecture capture and additional monitors.

Duration

Varies. Fall Jump Start convenings are 75 minutes; LEAD meetings are 2 hours; the course prep marathon runs from 9 am to 2 pm.

Equipment/technology

I've alluded to some of this above, but we try really hard to get rooms that are already pretty shiny (MLK 225, WSQ 205, BBC 32).

When we can't get those rooms, then we use an OWL camera to supplement the presenter's laptop.

Rather than worrying about connectivity issues, we log in to Zoom and Google slides or Powerpoint ahead of the meeting on a CFD laptop (similar to how COMM used to support hyflex faculty meetings). Participants/Presenters in Zoom are able to share slides that way, and we can hear them via the room's speaker system (or, in a pinch, the OWL, but that's only if things have gone sideways).

Presenters in the room use the CFD presenter laptop, and we also supplement with a microphone for better audio quality. Participants in the room may also choose to log in via Zoom, which is what we did when the projector died in ENG 285/287 a few weeks back. This allowed the "roomies" to see the slides we were sharing in Zoom.

A good camera pointed at the speaker (e.g., similar in quality to what's on an iPad Pro), a microphone and a laptop are essential.

Someone needs to be able to pass through the SSO for wifi, cloud docs/slides, and Zoom access.

A camera pointed at the audience is nice.

I'm less and less impressed with the OWL for large convenings, and I'm instead more interested in two cameras aimed appropriately.

If you're changing rooms a lot as we've done, it's wise to have a slide advancer and a pile of connectors (e.g., USB-C, HDMI).

If someone felt stressed out about looking at all the Zoom boxes (chat, video, participants, whatever), they make nice, lightweight portable monitors that sit next to or attach to your laptop. I haven't needed them, but we do have one in CFD just in case.

I also make sure to carry my phone and a set of noise canceling earphones in case I need to interact directly with Zoomies. The Apple air pods (I don't have the pro--I think they're 2nd gen) do a great job of noise canceling. I'm able to talk with Zoomies in a room full of people working in groups and they can hear me pretty well.

Tech support

We needed more in the beginning while we were figuring out how the different rooms worked and how it looked for roomies and Zoomies. If we're in MLK or BBC, we love the help we've received there.

Generally our analyst arrives early and works with that person to set everything up, and then I join closer to the meeting start time.

A lot of things are easier if you assemble a kit and use a checklist (e.g., turn on live transcription, check to make sure we're recording, check to make sure everyone's on mute, check audio quality with the Zoomies who arrive early).

Rationale

We have faculty colleagues who are 100% remote, and I don't want to exclude them from professional development opportunities. That's why you still see a lot of CFD + eCampus events in Zoom or on demand. When we do host synchronous online meetings, we're careful to make them low-stakes and very interactive. A few other reasons:

- (1) I want to make it easy for lecturer faculty to join our offerings, and they're spread thin enough as it is. This is a small thing I can do to make sure they're not excluded from opportunities for professional development.
- (2) I don't want people to feel as though they have to choose between taking care of themselves and others (e.g., staying home when they're sick, being able to engage in elder or child care) and learning more about how to do their work well, in ways that support them.
- (3) It facilitates recording and transcription of events, and, as AI captioning improves, I expect accessibility will be easier to manage in the Zoom than in the room.

And (4) personally I think it's important to choose the most effective modality depending on the learners' needs, the speaker's strengths, the planned activities, and a host of contextual factors. I didn't start out with online and hybrid modes as a strength, but I

understand that these can be a lifeline for adult learners, and I have worked carefully to increase my confidence and competence in using them.

Academic Innovation & Institutional Effectiveness

Submitted by

Sarah Schraeder, Research Associate/Program Coordinator

Note that Sarah facilitates all Program Planning Committee meetings (a committee of 20 members), External Review Exit meetings, and Action Plan meetings as hybrid meetings in the following way.

Additionally, Sarah and her team facilitated all forums for the Accreditation Review Team visit in April 2022 in hybrid modality with the assistance of the IMS team.

Location

Provost's Conference Room ([Clark Hall 412](#)) (note that the meeting registration form has a question about needing the OWL)

Facilitated by

1 person who facilitates the Zoom interactions, and 1 person who facilitates the in-room interactions.

Type of communication in the meetings

Presentations by speakers, both in person and via zoom; discussion; Q&A; deliberation; decision-making; document drafting; and voting

Attendance

from 10 to 40 in the room; from 5 to 30 via Zoom

Duration

from 45 to 1.5 hours

Equipment/technology

Each Zoom participant joins on their own device.

In the room there is a projector and 1 pull-down screen and a laptop which is connected to the projector.

The Zoom attendees' images are projected on the screen, and when they speak their voices are projected into the room via the [OWL intelligent 360° camera, mic, and speaker](#).

Speakers in the room can sit at their seats, and can be seen and heard by the Zoom participants via the in-room laptop's built-in camera.

Tech support

One trained staff person

Rationale

Facilitates access for those interested in joining meetings even though they are off campus.

It's a great way to accommodate those who are really interested in meeting in person as well as those who are only able to join via Zoom. We've found this expands attendance for meetings we'd traditionally see far fewer participants join.

Considering the varying faculty teaching and on/off campus schedules offering a hybrid modality creates more equitable opportunities for participation and allows us to ensure all voices can be heard.

Department of Communication Studies

Submitted by

Dr. Andrew Wood, COMM Department Chair
Nikki Mirza, COMM Department Administrative Analyst

Location

MLK 225

Facilitated by

Three departmental members, one of whom joined via Zoom and facilitated all Zoom interactions, and two of whom joined in person and facilitated the in-room interactions.

Type of communication in the meeting

Presentations, speeches, and testimonials, both planned and spontaneous; sharing of still images and recorded music.

Attendance

17 in the room; 17 on Zoom

Duration

about one hour

Equipment/technology

Each Zoom participant joined on their own device. In the room there was a projector and pull-down screen, a podium with a microphone, and a laptop which was connected to the projector. The Zoom attendees' images were projected on the screen, and when they spoke their voices were projected into the room via the projector's speaker system. Speakers in the room came to the podium to speak, and could be seen and heard by the Zoom participants via the in-room laptop's built in camera.

Tech support

The library assigned two Student Assistants to help with tech support

Rationale

We organized this memorial service as a hybrid event to accommodate participants who, given ongoing pandemic concerns, would otherwise be reluctant or unable to attend in person.

Department of Communication Studies Graduate Committee

Submitted by

Dr. Marie Haverfield, COMM Graduate Committee Chair

Location

HGH conference room, the Marie Carr Room

Facilitated by

1 person, committee chair who facilitates both the Zoom interactions, and the in-room interactions.

Type of communication in the meetings

Presentations by speakers, both in person and via zoom; discussions; Q&A; deliberations; policy drafting; voting.

Attendance

No more than 10 in the room, and no limit via Zoom

Duration

I would not necessarily put a range here. I think the duration would be consistent with any other meeting type.

Equipment/technology

Each Zoom participant joins on their own device. In the room each participant has a laptop in front of them, with the Zoom meeting open; their cameras are switched on, but only the meeting host (committee chair) has their microphone switched on (other in-room participants are on mute). The Zoom attendees have their cameras on and their mics muted except when they are speaking; and when they are speaking their voices are projected into the room via the chair's laptop.

If the meeting is held in a larger room, in-person participants may need to coordinate muting or move towards the unmuted computer in order for the Zoom participants to hear clearly.

Tech support

None.

Rationale

Everyone is already familiar with Zoom, accessible, enables visibility without having to use additional equipment, and provides captions regardless of who is speaking (in-person vs. online).

Student Union AV & Event Services Department

Submitted by

Erick J. Campos, AV Production Manager Student Union, Inc.
Donna L. Teutimez, Event Services Manager, Student Union, Inc.
Khristine Lugo, Event Planner, Division of University Advancement

Location

Student Union

Facilitated by

Usually around 2 -3 (1 usually a technician, the others are the event host) individuals facilitating zoom, and around 2- 4 facilitating in-room.

Type of communication in the meetings

1. usually a guest speaker in-person with attendees present in-room with others via zoom submitting Q&A through the chat or unmuting during discussion.
2. In-person discussion with guest speakers joining in via zoom.

Attendance

In person attendance 50 - 100, via zoom 5 - 20

Duration

From 1hr - 4hrs

Equipment/technology

Depending on the venue and the need determines the equipment. A small meeting room can use an OWL or Logitech conference cam with a conference mic easily.

When trying to build a virtual production with slides and logos a switcher is required with Projector, microphones and adaptors needed.

Ballroom setups will need a higher end camera to catch the distance and would require more labor to setup, operate, and cables to run.

With resources being low, having multiple venues at once needing equipment prevents consistent results.

Tech support

Ballroom setups: Would need audio tech, a lighting tech, a video tech running the switcher, a camera operator, and a zoom tech/runner. Usually will need a setup crew to prep and a tear down crew to reset the room.

Meeting Room size: a set up tech and camera tech. Depending on how much is needed. Usually can have a technician come by and check periodically if using an OWL or Logitech conference cam/mic

Rationale

Hybrid events: it allows those who are still hesitant in being around a lot of people (due to covid) the option to attend events at the comfort of their devices.

It gives attendees who are not comfortable with being back in-person yet an opportunity to still be part of the event

8 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
9 **Amendment A to University Policy S22-2**
10 **Student Excused Absences**

11
12 **Whereas:** The word "accommodation" is a legal term associated with making a
13 program accessible to a person with a disability; and
14

15 **Whereas:** Every effort should be made to utilize language that preserves the
16 meaning of a legally protected accommodation; therefore, be it,
17

18 **Resolved:** That S22-2 be edited as shown below.
19

20 **Approved:** November 28, 2022

21 **Vote:** 11-0-0

22 **Present:** Melinda Jackson (non-voting), Varun Jaiswal, Sharmin
23 Khan, Amy Leisenring (non-voting), Kelly Masegian,
24 Ravisha Mathur, Sabrina Pinnell, Eric Rollerson, Soma
25 Sen, Rushabh Sheta, Laura Sullivan-Green, Dominic
26 Treseler

27 **Absent:** Michael Chadwick, Caroline Chen, Nina Chuang, Henderson
28 Hill, Maria Martinez, Gilles Muler, Gregory Wolcott

29 **Financial impact:** None expected.

30 **Workload impact:** No anticipated change in workload from the current policy.

31

Student Excused Absences Policy

32 Students may have valid reasons to miss one or more classes, whether anticipated or
33 unforeseen. Students are responsible for informing their instructor in writing about such
34 absences as soon as possible. Absences may be considered “excused” and may require
35 accommodation modification or flexibility for course requirements.

36 1. Student responsibilities

37 If a student is aware of a future absence ahead of time, the student shall notify the
38 instructor in writing within the first two weeks of classes or as soon as the student learns
39 of the need for an absence. If the student must be absent for an unforeseen reason, they
40 shall inform the instructor as soon as circumstances permit.

41 Absences can happen for any number of reasons. The following list provides examples,
42 but there are many other possibilities not captured among these.

- 43 ○ ROTC or other military duties
- 44 ○ Jury duty
- 45 ○ Death of a family member or friend
- 46 ○ Illness or injury, including physical and mental health-related issues
- 47 ○ University-sanctioned SJSU Athletics competitions
- 48 ○ University-sanctioned leadership conferences
- 49 ○ Academic or research conferences
- 50 ○ Adding a class late (though still during the add period)
- 51 ○ Duties related to elected or appointed Associated Students representatives
- 52 ○ Mandatory work-related activity or travel that temporarily impacts a student’s
53 ability to participate in their academics
- 54 ○ Caregiving duties for family members, including parents, spouses or domestic
55 partners, a minor child, an adult child, a child of a domestic partner, grandparent,
56 grandchild, or sibling¹
- 57 ○ Personal instability in a student’s life that temporarily affects their ability to attend
58 class²
- 59 ○ Religious holidays (see University Policy [S14-7](#))
- 60 ○ Unanticipated emergencies or instabilities

61 2. Faculty responsibilities

62 Faculty shall treat personal matters of “reasons for absence” with the utmost sensitivity.
63 Students may have reasons included in the list above, or they may have others; they
64 also may be reluctant to mention specifics, and faculty should be understanding when
65 that is the case. Faculty should request documentation only in rare cases. (Faculty
66 members may only require students to provide verification for repeated or successive

¹ Family often extends beyond those defined herein. Faculty should be considerate of those family members that may not be clearly defined here, but have a familial relationship with the student.

² Personal instability may include housing instability, food insecurity, or other financial crises.

67 absences, or absences on the days of tests, presentations, and other graded activities.)
68 Faculty shall reasonably accommodate absences to the extent possible.

69 Excused absences normally should not exceed two cumulative weeks of class time. The
70 faculty member should make arrangements with the student to address missed learning
71 opportunities, which could include submitting work late, completing different but
72 comparable assignments, or waiving an assignment.

73 3. Possible considerations following extended absences

74 The following are situations when an excused absence could become an incomplete or a
75 course withdrawal. Students should consult with their instructor and advisor to determine
76 the most suitable course of action.

- 77 ○ If the absence exceeds two consecutive weeks of class time.
- 78 ○ If the student returns to the class and attempts in good faith to complete the
- 79 missing work but is overwhelmed and cannot finish.

1 **San Jose State University**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Professional Standards Committee**
4 **December 5, 2022**
5 **Final Reading**
6

AS 1840

7
8 **Policy Recommendation**
9 **Amendment A to University Policy F17-3**
10 **Selection and Review of Department Chairs and Directors**

11 Legislative History: This proposal would amend the policy on the selection and review of
12 Department Chairs and Directors

13
14 Rationale: University Policy F17-3 specifies that department chairs should ideally be
15 Professors, and that exceptions should only be made in “rare instances and
16 for compelling reasons.” As the normal Department Chair nomination
17 process requires an election by the faculty of the department, and election by
18 one’s peers is a “compelling reason” to appoint a Department Chair.
19 However, the appointment of interim chairs outside of the normal nomination
20 process is a less transparent process, despite a requirement for consultation
21 with department faculty. Transparency could be improved by requiring the
22 methods and results of consultation to be reported to the department faculty.
23 In addition, a normal nomination election should happen as soon as feasible
24 after the appointment of an interim chair, and while F17-3 is not silent on the
25 maximum appointment duration for an interim chair, the language could be
26 strengthened.
27

28
29 Resolved That sections 2 and 9 of F17-3 (Selection and Review of Department Chairs
30 and Directors) be modified as provided in this recommendation.
31

32
33 Approved: 11/21/22

34 Vote: 7-0-0

35 Present: French, Gómez, Kazemifar, Monday, Rapanot, Smith, Wang

36 Absent: Barrera
37

38 Financial Impact: None

39 Workload Impact: Some additional work on the part of College Deans to report the results
40 of department consultation
41

42
43
44
45
46
47

**SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY
ONE WASHINGTON SQUARE
SAN JOSÉ, CA 95192**

48 **F17-3, University Policy, Selection and Review of Department**
49 **Chairs and Directors**

50 **Legislative History:**

51 On December 11, 2017, the Academic Senate approved the following policy
52 recommendation presented by Senator Peter for the Professional Standards Committee.
53 This replacement of S14-8 incorporates the voting procedures for nominating Department
54 Chairs and Directors that were formerly only available in a separate policy. The need to
55 consult two separate policies each time a department nominates a Chair has led to
56 confusion and procedural errors in the past. In addition, the policy has been reformatted for
57 easier use and numerous corrections and clarifications have been incorporated at the
58 suggestion of the University Council of Chairs and Directors and the Deans. Among those
59 changes is a reordering of the policy to align chronologically with the stages of a Chair’s
60 nomination, election, evaluation, and possible removal.

61 **Rescinds: S14-8**

**Approved and signed by Mary A. Papazian
President, San José State University on
December 20, 2017.**

65

66 **UNIVERSITY POLICY**
67 **Selection and Review of Department Chairs and Directors**

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

70 *Rationale: This revision began with a referral from Organization and Government*
71 *regarding the consolidation of voting procedures for Chairs that became necessary as the*
72 *Department Voting Rights policy was revised. Next, a version was vetted before UCCD*
73 *last year which actively participated in crafting some of the changes. We additionally*
74 *received two rounds of suggestions and amendments from the Deans—most of which*
75 *were accepted and incorporated. This revision appeared for a first reading on March 13,*

76 2017 and for a final reading on April 10, 2017, but was pulled from the April 10 meeting to
77 allow time for additional consultation with the Provost. The Provost appeared before
78 Professional Standards on September 25 and relayed two concerns. The committee has
79 responded to both concerns and it is our understanding that the policy language is now
80 considered acceptable.

81 Following questions that occurred on the Senate floor at a final reading on November 20,
82 the policy was postponed to allow for revisions that would clarify voting procedures for the
83 various categories of faculty. This version incorporates the “friendly” amendments that
84 arose from the floor on November 20 and adds provision 3.8 to clarify how different
85 categories of faculty vote. Much of this language is imported directly from the Voting Rights
86 Policy, but there is greater clarity for defining the voting procedures for joint appointments
87 and for FERP and PRTB faculty (Articles 29 and 30 of the CSU/CFA Agreement.)

88 *Approved: November 6, 2017*

89 *Vote: 10-0-0*

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

92 *Absent: none*

93 *Reapproved with amendments shown: December 6, 2017*

94 *Vote: 9-0-0 email vote*

95 *Present: Chin, He, Marachi, Hamedi-Hagh, Kauppila, McKee, White, Peter, Kimbarow*

96 *Absent: Donahue*

97
98 *Financial Impact: No direct impacts. It is possible that this policy, by clarifying process,*
99 *could result in some savings.*

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

103

104 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
105 **Selection and Review of Department Chairs and Directors**

106 1. INTRODUCTION

107 1.1. Preamble

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

117 1.2. Definitions

118 1.2.1. Throughout this policy, the term “Chair” refers both to Chairs of
119 Departments and Directors of Schools, while the term “Department”
120 refers both to Departments and to Schools.

121 1.2.2. Departments elect a “nominee” to be department Chair; the
122 President appoints a nominee to become Chair. Hence department
123 elections are a nomination process with the outcome of choosing a
124 “Chair nominee” and are called “nomination elections.”

125 1.2.3. The terms “Professor” and “Associate Professor” are also
126 understood to include the equivalent titles in faculty disciplines that
127 use alternative names, such as librarians and counselors.

128 1.2.4. This policy uses the generic term “chair” to refer collectively to
129 all categories of chairs regardless of the manner of nomination and
130 appointment. When there is a need for greater differentiation, the
131 policy will refer to “acting chair” and “interim chair” as defined later in
132 the policy, and “regularly appointed chair” to refer to a chair who has
133 been nominated by the department and appointed by the President for
134 the standard four-year term.

135 2. QUALIFICATIONS

136 **2.1. Chairs should preferably be Professors but may be Associates Professors, if**
137 **nominated by the department faculty. Chairs and should have earned rank and**
138 **tenure prior to the time when the appointment to Chair would become effective.**
139 ~~Exceptions should only be made in rare instances and for compelling reasons.~~

140 2.2. Acting or Interim Chairs: When an Acting Chair is appointed through the regular
141 department nomination process (see section 3 below), section 2.1 applies. Acting or
142 Interim Chairs appointed outside of the regular department nomination process (see
143 section 9 below) should be Professors, but may be Associate Professors if there are
144 no willing Professors available to serve. Exceptions should only be made for
145 compelling reasons as determined by consultation with the department.

146 3. DEPARTMENT NOMINATING PROCESS

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

150 3.1. Deans and departments should communicate about transitions as early as
151 possible to allow for a collegial and orderly process. The Chair's job description—
152 which should include the fraction of assigned time to be provided to the Chair--
153 should be developed by the Dean in consultation with the Department.

154 3.2. College Election Committee. The College will create a College Election
155 Committee that will consist of three individuals: 1) The Dean or the Dean's
156 designee, 2) a member of the College RTP committee (chosen by the committee
157 from a department other than the one holding the nomination election), and 3) one
158 tenured faculty member from the department (chosen by the department tenured
159 and tenure track faculty from among those department faculty who are not
160 candidates.)

161 3.3. Responsibilities of the College Election Committee. The College Election
162 Committee shall see that the department is informed of the requirements of this
163 policy, shall (with the help of Faculty Affairs) interpret and explain the policy to the
164 department when questions arise, shall count and certify the votes, and shall see
165 that the results are delivered to the President and to the Department in the
166 appropriate formats.

167 3.4. Charging the Department. The Dean (or, at the Dean's option, the College
168 Election Committee) should attend a Department meeting at the beginning of the
169 nomination process to provide this policy and the Chair's job description and
170 fraction of assigned time, and to explain the process for nominating a Chair. If
171 following the charge, the Department proceeds immediately to a department
172 meeting as per the section below, then all persons who are not members of the
173 Department should depart before deliberations begin, unless specifically invited to
174 remain by the majority vote of the faculty present.

175 3.5. Department meeting. A meeting shall be held to begin the election of a
176 nominee to serve as Department Chair. The department may determine the nature
177 and medium of the meeting according to its own preferences, but the meeting must

178 be open to all faculty in the department and publicized a minimum of one week in
179 advance.

180 3.6. Decision on external search. The department may decide at this stage, through
181 normal voting procedures, to seek permission to search for an external chair (as per
182 section 4.1 below) instead of proceeding immediately with a normal nominating
183 election. Should permission be denied the department should proceed with the
184 normal process to nominate a department Chair.

185 3.7. Faculty may suggest names to appear on the ballot for the nominating election.
186 Nominated persons shall accept or decline nomination. Candidates will be given the
187 opportunity to make statements and take questions from department faculty.

188 3.8. Voting for Chair Nominees.

189 3.8.1. Tenured and tenure track faculty members have a full vote in the
190 department to which they are permanently assigned but no vote in a
191 department to which they are temporarily assigned. Tenured and tenure track
192 faculty holding joint appointments shall vote only in the department which
193 holds the majority of their permanent assignment or— if equal—in the
194 department that is responsible for their tenure. Tenured and tenure track
195 faculty members on an approved leave retain voting rights.

196 3.8.2. Faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP)¹
197 or the Pre-Retirement Reduction in Time Base Program (PRTB)² shall have a
198 proportional vote equal to their annualized time base (i.e, 1/2, 1/4) regardless
199 of their academic assignment in a given semester, through the last semester
200 of their teaching appointment.

201 3.8.3. Lecturers have departmental voting rights in proportion to their
202 assignment in a department. Proportional voting rights of lecturers may
203 fluctuate with fall and spring appointments. Lecturers on an approved partial
204 leave retain the proportional voting rights of their teaching assignment. Those
205 on full leave relinquish their voting rights.

206 3.8.4. Faculty suspended under article 17 (Temporary Suspension) of the
207 CBA retain their voting rights.

208 3.8.5. Voting rights of any faculty member are suspended for any semester
209 in which the individual holds a full-time administrative (i.e. MPP) or other full-
210 time non-faculty position in the university. Faculty on re-assigned time
211 engaged in administrative duties remain Unit 3 faculty and retain their voting
212 rights.

213 _____

214 ¹ See CFA/CSU Agreement Article 29. FERP employees are limited by contract to 50% of
215 their previous time base.

216 ² See CFA/CSU Agreement Article 30. PRTB employees are reduced by contract to 2/3,
217 1/2, or 1/3 of their previous time base.

218

219 3.8.6. Visiting Professors or Interim or Acting Chairs from outside the
220 department may not vote in a Chair nomination election.

221 3.8.7. Qualified faculty on approved leaves should be provided a means to
222 vote in a chair nomination election. However, no faculty member may grant
223 their vote by “proxy” to another individual.

224 3.9. The nominating election. Faculty may then vote by secret ballot on all
225 candidates proposed and willing to serve. Balloting must be available for 5 working
226 days and provide the opportunity to abstain.

227 3.9.1. If there is just one candidate, balloting must still occur, with a choice
228 provided to “recommend” or “do not recommend” the candidate.

229 3.9.2. If there are two or more candidates, balloting will provide a choice
230 between the candidates and a choice “do not recommend any candidate.”

231 3.9.3. If an election with three or more candidates fails to produce a majority
232 for any candidate, there shall be a second round of balloting between those
233 two candidates who received the most votes in the first round.

234 3.10. Counting the votes. The college election committee will meet to count votes.
235 The candidates will be notified of the time and place of the count at least one day in
236 advance, and each may send one observer (other than themselves). The committee
237 is responsible for an accurate count and review of ballots. The committee will
238 assure that balloting was secret, that votes are entered in the correct category, and
239 that proper proportions are applied. The results shall be certified (signed) by the
240 election committee.

241 3.11. Forwarding the results of the nominating election. Only the name of a
242 candidate who receives a majority of votes cast by the tenured and probationary
243 faculty shall be recommended to the President via the College Dean as the
244 nominee of the department.³ The names of candidates who were not recommended
245 by the department, together with all vote totals, shall also be forwarded to the
246 President to provide context for the recommendation. This shall include a statement
247 of the vote of all faculty, broken down into two categories – vote by tenured/tenure
248 track faculty and by lecturers -- including the actual number of votes cast in each
249 category.

250 _____

251 ³ See CFA/CSU Agreement 20.30.

252

253 3.12. Distributing the results. The department voting results shall also be distributed
254 to the faculty from the relevant department. If the final vote total in either category of
255 votes (tenured and probationary, lecturers) contains a fraction, it shall be rounded to
256 help preserve anonymity.

257 3.13. Second round nomination elections. If a department is unable to nominate a
258 Chair by a majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty, it may continue to
259 try to obtain a nominee by repeating the process if they are willing and the Dean
260 determines that there is sufficient time. Otherwise the situation will be resolved via
261 section 6 “Failure to Obtain...”

262 4. EXTERNAL SEARCHES

263 4.1. Request for an external search. An external search is a search in which
264 candidates from outside San José State University are invited to apply to be hired
265 as a tenured faculty member and as department Chair. Department faculty may
266 request an external search for department chair. A department request for an
267 external search should take the form of a majority vote of the department (following
268 normal procedures for department voting rights). Such requests are not
269 automatically granted.

270 4.2. Procedures for an external search. Successful completion of an external
271 search for a department Chair requires coordination of two separate tasks: the
272 appointment of a new faculty member in accordance with the appointment policy
273 and the recommendation to the President of a Chair nominee in accordance with
274 this policy. To expedite the successful conclusion of such a search, departments
275 may combine some procedures that are common to both processes as outlined
276 below. Departments should determine which of these three alternatives they will use
277 by majority vote (following the normal procedures for department voting rights), and
278 they must do so prior to the start of a search. Whichever method the department
279 adopts, the recruitment committee must conform to the normal requirements of the
280 appointments policy.

281 4.2.1. Departments may designate all tenured and tenure track faculty as a
282 recruitment committee “of the whole” so that the appointment
283 recommendation and the nomination recommendation are coterminous.
284 When this method is chosen, the committee of the whole must provide
285 lecturers with the opportunity to provide confidential feedback on the search
286 prior to final recommendations. A department may only use this method
287 when there are more tenured faculty than probationary faculty. If it chooses

288 this method, the normal prohibition of faculty serving on a personnel
289 committee evaluating faculty of higher rank is suspended.

290 4.2.2. Departments may use separate processes for the appointment and for
291 the nomination functions associated with an external search for a department
292 Chair. Using this method, a smaller recruitment committee makes a
293 recommendation under the normal appointment policy. Then the department
294 as a whole votes to endorse or not to endorse the recommendation of the
295 recruitment committee. For each candidate, the department's endorsement
296 must specify whether or not that candidate is acceptable as a Chair. If more
297 than one candidate is acceptable, the department must rank them in order of
298 preference. The department's endorsement serves to nominate a candidate
299 to be Chair, but should be accompanied by the recruitment committee's
300 report to justify the appointment. In the event of conflict between the
301 recommendations of the recruitment committee and the department, the
302 department makes the final recommendation as to who to nominate as its
303 Chair, but may only nominate from among those candidates deemed to be
304 acceptable finalists by the recruitment committee. When this method is
305 chosen by a department, time must be budgeted to allow these procedures
306 to take place at the conclusion of the search.

307 4.2.3. Departments may choose to delegate their prerogative to nominate a
308 Chair exclusively to their recruitment committee.

309 4.3. In conformity with the Appointments policy, an external nominee for Chair shall
310 be reviewed and must receive a favorable recommendation for tenure from the
311 appropriate personnel committee of the department before the appointment can be
312 completed.

313 5. APPOINTMENT

314 1. 5.1. The President appoints and removes the Department Chair in
315 consultation with the Provost, College Dean, and department faculty. The
316 term of the appointment is normally four years.

317 2. 5.2. When a department follows the procedures of this policy to successfully
318 elect a Chair Nominee, the President shall -- except in rare instances and for
319 compelling reasons—appoint that individual to serve as Department Chair.

320 3. 5.3. Technical details concerning the appointment of a Chair (appointment
321 letters, salary adjustments, etc.) will be coordinated by the Office of the
322 Provost.

323 6. FAILURE TO OBTAIN CHAIR NOMINEES AS DESCRIBED IN SECTIONS 3 324 (Nominations), 8 (Reappointment), and 10 (Acting)

325 Departments may be unable to successfully conclude a normal nomination for
326 Department Chair. This could be the case in a department with no senior leadership

327 qualified to be Chair, or no willing candidates. If a department fails to reach
328 consensus (majority vote of the tenured and probationary faculty) following a normal
329 nomination process (Section 3), the Dean shall consult with the faculty at a
330 department meeting to determine the best course of action. This could be either the
331 nomination of an interim or acting Chair, initiation of an external search, extension
332 of a prior interim appointment, or nomination of a non-departmental interim Chair--
333 as per the relevant sections of this policy.

334 6.1. External Search. An external search may be requested as per section 4
335 of the policy, although such requests are not automatically granted.

336 6.2. Extended interim Chairs. If there has been a failure to reach consensus,
337 and an interim Chair is serving and was not a candidate for Chair, the interim
338 Chair may be extended by six months to allow time for more permanent
339 solutions. Normally, a department should not have to operate under interim
340 leadership for more than one year.

341 6.3. Non departmental interim Chairs. In extreme cases, and only when all of
342 the aforementioned measures fail, the President may appoint a SJSU faculty
343 member from outside the department to serve as interim Chair, after
344 consultation with the College Dean and department faculty. External
345 departmental interim Chairs are subject to all the normal limits provided in
346 section 9. Consultation with the department faculty is normally done by the
347 Provost and Dean soliciting advice at a department meeting.

348 6.4. Extended interim Chairs. The extension of an interim appointment
349 beyond one year should be avoided if possible. If this occurs the
350 Organization and Government Committee of the Academic Senate shall
351 inquire into the reasons for the situation.

352 7. REVIEW OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

353 7.1. Timing of Normal Review: The Dean shall initiate the formal review of each
354 Department Chair during the fourth year of an incumbent's term, unless the
355 incumbent states that he/she will not be a candidate to continue as Chair beyond
356 the fourth year.

357 7.2. Early Review: Department faculty may initiate a formal review of the
358 Department Chair by submitting a petition to the Dean, provided that at least one
359 academic year has passed since the Chair's appointment or previous review. The
360 petition shall state simply that "The undersigned faculty call for a prompt review of
361 our Department Chair." If the petition is signed by department faculty totaling more
362 than 50% of the department electorate, the College Dean will initiate a formal review
363 of the Department Chair. The petition should preferably be delivered early enough
364 to permit the review to be completed before the end of the current semester, but an
365 early review should always be completed within 40 duty days from receipt of the

366 petition. To determine if the petition exceeds the 50% threshold, the signatures of
367 both tenure/tenure track faculty and lecturers will be counted, with the signatures of
368 lecturers weighted according to the proportion of their appointment. The Dean will
369 announce the number of signatures and whether the petition exceeds the threshold,
370 but will keep the petition itself and the signed names confidential from the
371 incumbent chair.

372 7.3. Appointment and Composition of Review Committee: At the beginning of the
373 fourth year of the Department Chair's term, under the direction of the College Dean,
374 the tenured and tenure-track department faculty shall elect from its ranks a peer
375 review committee to evaluate the Department Chair's performance⁴. The review
376 committee, in consultation with the College Dean, will determine the procedures and
377 scope of the review.

378 7.4. Criteria for Review: The review committee, in consultation with the College
379 Dean, shall specify the criteria for evaluating the incumbent's job performance. The
380 principal criteria shall be derived from the job description that was provided to the
381 Chair at the time of appointment. The incumbent shall be asked to examine the
382 criteria developed and to make such comments or suggestions as may seem
383 advisable.

384 7.5. Procedures for Review: The review committee, in consultation with the College
385 Dean, shall develop procedures for conducting the review. The procedures shall be
386 designed to secure appropriate information and appraisals of performance from as
387 many persons as may be feasible who are knowledgeable of the incumbent's
388 performance. If he/she so desires, the incumbent shall be given an opportunity to
389 provide the review committee with a self-evaluation based upon the criteria
390 developed by the committee. The opinions and judgments received by review
391 committees, the deliberations and reports of such committees, and any
392 accompanying materials, shall be confidential.

393 7.6. Report of the Review Committee: At the conclusion of its evaluative activities,
394 the review committee shall prepare a written report embodying findings and
395 conclusions. The report of the review committee shall include a statement of
396 strengths found and improvements desired in the incumbent's performance with
397 respect to the evaluative criteria. All raw data collected for review shall accompany,
398 but not be part of, the review committee's summary narrative. Before forwarding the
399 final report to the College Dean, the review committee shall:

400 7.6.1. Provide a draft copy of the narrative portion of the report to the
401 incumbent;

402 7.6.2. Provide the incumbent with an opportunity to meet with the review
403 committee in order to discuss the report;

404 _____

405 ⁴ See CFA/CSU Agreement Article 15

406

407 7.6.3. Provide the incumbent with the opportunity to submit to the committee
408 a written statement which shall become part of the report to the College
409 Dean.

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

415 7.7. Confidentiality. The review committee, college dean, and officers of the
416 University shall hold in confidence data received by the review committee, its report,
417 and accompanying materials.

418 8. REAPPOINTMENT OF A DEPARTMENT CHAIR

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

421 9. SELECTION OF AN INTERIM CHAIR

422 An interim appointment occurs when a Department Chair's position has or will be
423 vacated and there is insufficient time or it is otherwise impractical to complete the
424 regular nomination process explained in Section I (Nominations). The interim Chair
425 serves only as long as required to complete the appointment of a regularly
426 appointed chair, **normally by the end of the next full semester.**

427 9.1. Appointment procedure. The President may make interim appointments after
428 consultation with the College Dean and department faculty, normally by soliciting
429 advice from as many faculty as possible at a department meeting called for this
430 purpose. **The College Dean shall report to the department the methods and results**
431 **of consultation at the time of the appointment of an interim chair.**

432 9.2. Interim Chair requirements. Interim appointments should normally be a
433 member of the department in which they will serve **and they should be tenured**
434 **faculty members** (see section 6 for exceptions.)

435 9.3. Transition to a regularly appointed Chair. While overseeing all the complex
436 tasks of the department, the interim Chair's ultimate responsibility is to prepare the
437 department for an orderly transition to a regularly appointed Chair. The interim Chair
438 should serve until a regularly appointed Chair takes office, normally before the
439 beginning of the next academic year when taking office in the summer or Fall, or by

440 the beginning of the following Spring semester when taking office in the Spring. If
441 the department cannot transition to a regularly appointed Chair within one year, the
442 situation should be resolved under section 6 (Failure to Obtain) of this policy.

443 9.4. Technical details concerning the appointment of an interim Chair (appointment
444 letter, salary adjustments, etc.) will be coordinated by the Office of the Provost.

445 10. SELECTION OF AN ACTING CHAIR

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

451 10.1. Planned need for acting Chair. When the short-term absence of a Chair can
452 be anticipated, the Department should nominate an Acting Chair using the
453 procedures outlined in section 3 (normal nomination.)

454 10.2. Sudden need for acting Chair. When there is insufficient time or it is otherwise
455 impractical to complete the regular nomination process explained in section 3, an
456 Acting Chair should be designated using the procedures outlined in section 9
457 (interim.)

458 10.3. Limit on length of service. An Acting Chair should not serve more than one
459 full academic year, and possibly the summer before or after the academic year. A
460 Chair who is absent for more than one year should be replaced.

461 10.4. Technical details concerning the appointment of an acting Chair (appointment
462 letter, salary adjustments, etc.) will be coordinated by the Office of the Provost.

463 11. REMOVAL OF DEPARTMENT CHAIR

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

467 11.1. Administrative removal. The administrative removal of a Chair previously
468 recommended by the faculty of a department is a very serious matter, and should
469 only be undertaken for compelling reasons. A Chair will be given an opportunity to
470 meet with the Provost and Dean to defend their record prior to removal. Following
471 removal, the President or Provost should meet with the Dean and the faculty
472 assembled in a department meeting to announce the action and solicit advice on
473 the transition. Replacement of the Chair should be initiated according to the
474 procedures in sections 3 or 9 of this policy.

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

484

1 **San Jose State University**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Professional Standards Committee**
4 **December 5, 2022**
5 **Final Reading**
6

AS 1842

7 **Sense of the Senate Resolution**

8 **In Opposition to the Exclusion of Faculty Early Retirement**
9 **Program Faculty From Pandemic Compensation**

10 **Whereas:** The Chancellor’s Office of the California State University (“CSU”), in conjunction with
11 the California Faculty Association, negotiated, and their constituents ratified, a new Collective
12 Bargain Agreement (“CBA”) on March 22, 2022, which in part provides for faculty of the CSU to
13 receive additional pay for having to spend time, transforming face-to-face classes into online
14 courses during the 2020 pandemic period, and

15 **Whereas:** the CBA specifically calls out in section 31.7 that faculty shall receive a one-time
16 \$3500 payment per fulltime faculty, and a proportionate share of that amount pro rata for part
17 time faculty, based on the hours worked during the period in question, and

18 **Whereas:** Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) faculty, per the CBA, were to be included
19 in such payment, subject to CalPERS approval, which subsequently has ruled such payment is
20 not allowed, based on a prohibition of “extra pay for extra work”, FERP faculty being constrained
21 per CalPERS law to 960 hours per year, and

22 **Whereas:** FERP faculty worked just as hard to convert their classes to online instruction as did
23 any other faculty, and

24 **Whereas:** both the Academic Senate of the California State University (“ASCSU”) and the
25 California State University Emeritus and Retired Faculty and Staff Association (“CSU-ERFSA”)
26 have issued resolutions supporting this FERP payment under the CBA; therefore be it

27 **Resolved:** That the Academic Senate of San José State University (SJSU) strongly supports
28 the sentiments expressed in the resolution of CSU-ERFSA; be it further

29 **Resolved:** That the Academic Senate of San José State University (SJSU) urges both the CSU
30 Chancellor and the President of CFA to direct their relevant professional staff and legal counsel
31 to work collaboratively to address CalPERS’ interpretation of regulations that negate the clear
32 language and intent of the CBA to compensate FERP and other RA faculty; be it further

33 **Resolved:** That copies of this resolution shall be distributed widely to students, faculty, and staff
34 members of the SJSU community, to the Academic Senate of the CSU, to the CSU Chancellor,
35 Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, President of CFA, Faculty Trustee of the Board
36 of Trustees, the CalPERS Board of Administration, the CalPERS Chief Executive Officer, and
37 the CalPERS Deputy Executive Officer, Customer Services & Support.
38

39
40 **Approved:** November 21, 2022
41

42 **Vote:** 7-0-0

43

44 **Present:** French, Gómez, Kazemifar, Monday, Rapanot, Smith, Wang

45

46 **Absent:** Barrera

47

48 **Financial Impact:** None foreseen

49

50 **Workload Impact:** None foreseen

Dear Chair Mckee and Fellow Senators,

It is my greatest pleasure and honor to run for the Chair position of the Curriculum and Research (C&R) Committee.

I am Hiu Yung Wong, an Associate Professor and Silicon Valley AMDT Endowed Chair in Electrical Engineering, College of Engineering. This is my fifth year at SJSU but I have 12 years of industry experience. I also served on our college's Associate Dean Search Committee, Assessment Committee, Strategic Plan Task Force, and Department Chair Review Committee. I received the national McGraw Research Award, NSF CAREER Award, and COE Award for Faculty Excellence. The achievements in my research and teaching activities are not possible without some of the important policies set forth by the Senate, particularly those by the C&R committee.

I just started my Senate position this Fall. And I also just started serving on the C&R committee this Fall. So, to be honest, I am still learning how the Senate and the C&R Committee operate. However, I think I truly appreciate the importance of the work done by the C&R Committee, which is "responsible for all matters relating to curriculum and research and for development of an academic master plan". In every C&R meeting, I learned from our current Chair Senator Marie Haverfield and other dedicated members how important it is to improve a current policy and propose a new policy with due diligence, as this impacts every aspect of SJSU from individual students to a college. This is the reason I want to try this challenging position because I feel this might be the most impactful and meaningful task I can have at SJSU.

Thank you very much for your support!

Hiu-Yung Wong