

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE

2016/2017

Agenda

December 12, 2016, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm

Engineering 285/287

- I. **Call to Order and Roll Call**
- II. **Approval of Minutes:**
Senate Minutes of November 21, 2016
- III. **Communications and Questions:**
 - A. From the Chair of the Senate
 - B. From the President
- IV. **State of the University Announcements:**
 - A. Associated Students President
 - B. Vice President for University Advancement
 - C. Statewide Academic Senators
 - D. Provost
 - E. Vice President for Administration and Finance
 - F. Vice President for Student Affairs
- V. **Executive Committee Report:**
 - A. Minutes of the Executive Committee –
Executive Committee Minutes of November 14, 2016
 - B. Consent Calendar –
Consent Calendar of December 12, 2016
 - C. Executive Committee Action Items –
- VI. **New Business:**
 - A. ***Break for Cake and Cider, Time Certain: 4 p.m.***
- VII. **Unfinished Business:**
- VIII. **Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation)**
 - A. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
 - B. Organization and Government Committee (O&G)
AS 1639, Policy Recommendation, Modification of Bylaw 4.1: Senate Executive Committee Membership (Final Reading)

AS 1621, Policy Recommendation, Departmental Voting Rights (Final Reading)

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

***AS 1642, Policy Recommendation, Change in Membership and Charge of
the Student Success Committee (First Reading)***

C. University Library Board (ULB):

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

***AS 1641, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy
S16-14, Clarification of 'Internship' (First Reading)***

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

IX. Special Committee Reports:

X. Adjournment:

2016/2017 Academic Senate

MINUTES
November 21, 2016

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:08 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Forty-Four Senators were present.

Ex Officio:

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

CASA Representatives:

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

Administrative Representatives:

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

COB Representatives:

Present: Reade, Rodan
Absent: Campsey

Deans:

Present: Stacks, Jacobs, Schutten
Absent: Green

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Laker, Mathur
Absent: None

Students:

Present: Balal, Spica, Tran,
Medrano, Medina
Absent: Caesar

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Sullivan-Green, Chung
Absent: Hamed-Hagh

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters
Absent: None

H&A Representatives:

Present: Frazier, Grindstaff,
Ormsbee, Miller, Khan
Absent: Riley

Emeritus Representative:

Present: None
Absent: Buzanski

SCI Representatives:

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

Honorary Representative:

Present: None
Absent: Lessow-Hurley

SOS Representatives:

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

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Matoush, Higgins, Trousdale,
Kauppila
Absent: None

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

The minutes of October 24, 2016 were approved as amended by Senator Van Selst (44-0-0).

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Kimbarow commented on the recent presidential election and noted that at SJSU we would continue to provide a safe and welcoming campus for all our students.

Chair Kimbarow introduced the ASCSU Chair, Chris Miller.

B. From the ASCSU Chair –

Chair Miller announced that she has been visiting all of the campuses. The Executive Committee of the ASCSU establishes priorities at the beginning of the year. The priorities this year are to promote academic quality by censoring three areas. Those areas are shared governance, faculty advocacy and governmental relations, and CSU relationship with the Academic Senate. Visiting the campuses gives Chair Miller the opportunity to see what happens at different campuses. For instance, many campuses do not have food and drinks at their Senate and Executive Committee meetings.

Chair Miller has been to San Francisco, Sacramento, San Bernadino, Fresno, Sonoma, Channel Islands, and Pomona. Next week Chair Miller will be at San Diego State. Chair Miller has been learning a lot about what it means to represent the faculty in the CSU system. For instance, what to do when an irate parent emails her and says her child has to take early start and what is Chair Miller going to do about it? Chair Miller has also learned what it means to be a representative for the CSU and the faculty.

Chair Miller made a presentation to the American Association of University Presidents Shared Governance Conference. We, the CSU, are the largest system representing comprehensive universities in the nation. Chair Miller attended a presentation while there by the Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities. Our Board of Trustees is a member of that Association.

The association did some research on shared governance in higher education. Their study was titled, “Shared Governance—Is okay good enough?” One of the elements in the study that struck Chair Miller is as follows, “The principle of shared governance acknowledges the authority distributed to both the administration and the faculty as a basic tenet of higher education.” The report notes that “when it works well, shared governance brings a wealth of ideas to critical conversations and creates a sense of inclusiveness that strengthens and supports decisions and can be an essential institutional asset.” As Chair Miller travels to different campuses, she has been speaking about shared governance.

As far as answering the question, “Is okay good enough? Chair Miller believes that it is not good enough. We have to do more to ensure shared governance is not just “okay.” Chair Miller believes we need to be just as audacious in promoting shared governance as we are in promoting the graduation initiative. Without shared governance the goals of the graduation initiative will not be able to be accomplished. The people who did this study asked the Chancellor to participate in the next phase. The next phase involves doing 12 case studies and they have asked to interview the Chancellor, the ASCSU Chair, and the Board Trustee, Rebecca Eisen.

Some resolutions that the ASCSU has recently approved include a resolution asking for increased funding for the CSU to avert tuition increases, and a resolution supporting the support budget for the Board of Trustees which includes \$75 million for the graduation initiative. The ASCSU went further and recommended that half of those funds be earmarked for improving tenure density. Another resolution that was passed dealt with APR 158 and the ASCSU pointed out that they are very interested in transfer issues. The

ASCSU also passed a resolution asking for a taskforce on general education issues. There was a resolution in response to the C- grading in the golden four suggesting following the rules for general education credit from the institution where the student completed the course. The final resolution endorsed all the recommendations of the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force, and encouraged the Chancellor's Office to follow through with those recommendations. The ASCSU has been seeing some good progress in terms of responses to resolutions.

Some issues the Senate has discussed but have not yet resulted in resolutions include; Academic Freedom and Intellectual Property, and what a Trump presidency will do to higher education. Many students have been shaken to their core and are really fearful of about their future and the future of their families. The ASCSU will be keeping an eye on that.

C. President of the University –

President Papazian thanked Senators for attending today and for all their hard work on behalf of our students. President Papazian had the pleasure of watching Chair Miller advocate for us at the Board of Trustee's meeting.

We are in a unique moment where there are shared interests. Where it is in all of our best interests to work together for the greater good and purpose across the state and locally.

The local newspaper reported over the last couple of days on the "positive economic outlook for the state of California both in terms of the budget and in terms of its rainy day fund. This is a time where the state has the capacity to reinvest in the most significant economic driver and that is the education of its young people."

Many of our student are fearful of what the future holds. We need to continue to provide an environment where our students can succeed.

Questions:

Q: Senator Rodan announced that he had been trying to use some software in his class and he wanted to use the professional development funds he got from the department to purchase the software licenses and was told he could not use those funds to pay for software. Senator Rodan considers this an intrusion into the way he conducts his class.

A: President Papazian responded that she really had no idea about the funding and the Provost is not here today, so she will have to check with him and report back to the Senate.

Q: Are faculty being provided resources in their classes to support conversations and concerns students have regarding the recent presidential election and what the future may hold for them?

A: President Papazian has every confidence in our faculty that they will arrange their syllabus to engage students. In addition, there are broader resources available for the kinds of conversations students may want or need to have. Many of these have been

ongoing conversations through the Student Affairs Division, and President Papazian encouraged all students to take advantage of what they have to offer. President Papazian thinks that faculty need to continue to focus on providing education in the classroom as much as possible.

Q: Senator Chung runs two international programs that take students abroad for several weeks out of the year, and also brings about 100 students from all over the world to SJSU. Since the College of Engineering doesn't have a permanent dean yet, Senator Chung is basically doing this himself. Senator Chung asked the President what he should do in terms of his programs?

A: President Papazian responded that Senator Chung has an Interim Dean, and while in that position he/she has the authority of a dean. The permanent dean has been selected and will be here this summer. President Papazian advised Senator Chung to work with the leadership in the Dean of Engineering Office and also in the Provost Office.

IV. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

EC Minutes of October 17, 2016 –

Questions:

Senator Boekema asked about page 2 where it talks about the Science building discussions moving forward, this is not very informative. What progress has been made in financial planning and funding with regard to this building?

Answer:

VP and Senator Faas announced that just this week at the Board of Trustees meeting our Science Building was approved for up to \$127 million. We started this summer in the \$87 million range. This is very positive news.

EC Minutes of October 31, 2016 – no questions.

B. Consent Calendar –

Consent Calendar of October 24, 2016—approved (44-0-0).

Election Calendar of 2017—approved (44-0-0).

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

Senator Peter presented *AS 1636, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Reaffirming San José State University's Commitment to an Inclusive Campus Climate and our Determination to Provide a Safe, Supportive, and Welcoming Community (Final Reading)*. The Senate voted and AS 1636 was approved (39-0-1).

Senator Tran requested that his vote be changed to approved. The Senate voted and the Tran motion passed (40-0-0). The vote on AS 1636 will now reflect (40-0-0).

V. New Business – None

VI. **Unfinished Business:** None

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

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

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1628, Policy Recommendation, Modification of Bylaw 15 Pertaining to Editorial Changes of Senate Documents (Final Reading)*. Senator Van Selst presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change, “the document” at the end of line 26 to read, “the policy recommendation.” **The Senate voted and AS 1628 was approved as amended (38-1-1).**

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1629, Policy Recommendation, Concurrent Membership on Operating and Policy Committees (Final Reading)*. Senator White presented an amendment to strike the sentence that begins on line 36 and ends on line 39 that reads, “If concurrent membership is unavoidable, the administrator will serve as an ex officio nonvoting member on the operating committee and an ex officio voting member on the parent policy committee unless otherwise dictated by university policy pertaining to committee membership.” **The Senate voted and the white amendment failed (7-29-1). The Senate voted and AS 1629 passed as written (38-0-0).**

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1634, Modification of Senate Constitution Related to Membership (Final Reading)*. **The Senate voted and AS 1634 passed as written (39-0-0).**

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1639, Policy Recommendation, Modification of Senate Bylaw 4.1, Senate Executive Committee Membership (First Reading)*. AS 1639 is a bylaw amendment that parallels the constitutional amendment that was just passed (AS 1634). This policy recommendation would modify the administrative representation on the Executive Committee. It would remove the Vice President for University Advancement and replace that seat with the Chief Diversity Officer. [There were no questions.]

Senator Shifflett announced that she was pulling *AS 1635, Amendment A to University Policy S16-8, Selection and Review of Administrators (Final Reading)* from the agenda today. She gave the following explanation, “Once an item goes out to the campus, it is not uncommon for the committee to get questions that have nothing to do with the amendment proposed. This needs to go back to O&G to address two things that came up that did not have to do with the proposed changes from O&G. The first item is can we build in some language that clarifies that when

you need five faculty members on a search or review committee do all five have to come from different departments? The answer is yes, but it isn't written in the policy so we need to clarify this. The second thing we need to do is build in language to allow for the addition of members to address the diversity or expertise needed on a search committee, so we need to take this back to O&G for consideration.

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1621, Policy Recommendation, Department Voting Rights (First Reading)*. This is a first reading for the third time.

Section 2.2 clarifies that the department can now establish areas that lecturers can vote on except those excluded by other policies. Section 2.2.1 establishes that voting can be conducted in multiple ways if department guidelines provide for that. Section 3.6 clarifies what to do regarding voting rights for faculty on suspension.

Questions:

Q: On line 50 it specifies voting by tenured and tenure-track faculty is required and there are several interpretations possible.

A: That was a mistake, O&G meant to fix that. O&G had three emails regarding that.

Q: I am particularly pleased that the language has been changed from regular and temporary faculty to tenure/tenure-track faculty and lecturers. Would the default position for departments be that lecturers have no departmental voting rights unless they actually establish bylaws in order to grant voting rights to lecturers?

A: My interpretation is that the default position you are speaking about pertains to curriculum only. The default position on curriculum is that voting is the purview of the tenure and tenure-track faculty unless it is opened up to lecturers by department policy.

Q: I'm wondering why on lines 178 and 179 FERP faculty are singled out as people who need to take part in deliberations preceding a vote?

A: That was in the old version of the policy. We changed that in this last first reading. The FERP section is now 3.5.

Q: In 2.4.1. you might want to reference back to bylaws, because when I read that section it appears as if for any given issue people might choose one of those ways. You need to tie that in with the other restrictions or clarifications. Congratulations on distinguishing between Articles 17 and 19. That was a brilliant move. I think that you might want to either put a footnote or the title of the article, because occasionally things get renumbered.

A: Thank you.

Q: I have a question about line 160 and "representative committees," can't they also have tenure/tenure-track and lecturers?

A: Thank you.

Q: On 2.4 you have in parenthesis, "Inclusive of establishing and modifying courses,

standard texts and materials.” I think “standard texts and materials” might be more than is necessary.

A: Thank you.

Q: Would the committee consider making 4.2 the new 4.1 and 4.1 the new 4.2. Section 4.2 seems to come first.

A: Thank you.

Q: I misunderstood 3.5, do FERP faculty have full voting rights even when off?

A: Yes.

Q: Could you explain the purpose of Section 1.3 regarding the “Formal vote”?

A: This goes back to last semester when we started to gather information. People were asking questions that led us to believe they weren’t clear on what a formal vote was, so we decided to add a section describing it.

Q: Are other types of votes less sanctioned?

A: No.

Q: If they are, then why do we need a definition of a formal vote?

A: That is a good question and we will take it up.

Q: When and under what circumstances are a professor’s voting rights suspended? I believe that if a professor is suspended disciplinarily, or put on paid/unpaid leave involuntarily that they should not be allowed to vote. Could you please indicate the current wording or reasoning for allowing this?

A: Yes, Article 19 states that, “This article shall pertain to all bargaining unit employees excluding temporary employees that have been employed for one semester, quarter, or less. Sanctions imposed in a disciplinary action shall be limited to a dismissal of the motion, or suspension without pay. Our clause is about suspension and it applies to suspension without pay as a disciplinary action. That is the condition under which the voting rights are removed.”

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1638, Policy Recommendation, Bylaw 2.2, Pertaining to Term Length for Senate Chair (First Reading)*. This resolution would do away with the one-year plus one-year arrangement we have had for the past 20 years. In its place we would make the term of the Senate Chair two years. The Vice Chair would also be elected to a two-year term, and then serve as Chair for two years, and then serve as Past Chair for one year. This policy recommendation keeps in place the fact that in alternate years when there is no Past Chair, the Senate would elect a Faculty-at-Large member to sit on the Executive Committee.

Questions:

Q: Traditionally, the vote to renew for another year is an important event, so I’m wondering what the motivation for the change is?

A: The sense is that a person coming in has the stability to plan for a two-year term and this gives them a stability that is not there currently and allows them to plan for a longer term. These two things seem to be very important in helping the chair become

part of the leadership team of the university.

Q: Did the committee consider what would happen if the Senate made a mistake and elected someone who did not work out? This is really not a one-year plus one-year, this would be two-years as Vice Chair, then two-years as Chair, and finally one-year as Past Chair. A single vote would result in a term of five-years. Wouldn't it be good to have a check and balance somewhere along the line?

A: I hear what you are saying, but the cost of that is the uncertainty and the perception that a Senate Chair is temporary and he/she might be engaged with differently. Good food for thought. I will bring back to the committee.

B. University Library Board (ULB) – None.

C. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) – None.

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

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

This policy rescinds University Policy F11-2 on continuous enrollment for graduate students. In 2011 we passed a policy that stated that if graduate students received a Report-in-Progress grade on their thesis or project, they were required to maintain continuous enrollment in the university. The way that has been handled is that students register for a 1-unit class in a special session. This helps offset some of the cost of them remaining in the university. This policy acknowledges that the time a student needs to remain in a Report-in-Progress grade in one department may be different from another department. The proposal is to create a three-tiered fee system of 1-unit-, 2-unit, or 3-units that a department would make a case for why they need to be in that unit program.

Questions:

Q: In our department we give out permission codes, are we bypassing the department entirely with this?

A: No, when you give out a permission code a student is still registering for that course, you are just giving them a code to register for it. What this does is allow the student to register in special session for a much cheaper price.

Q: You said programs would be assigned to a tier?

A: That's correct. Programs would have to make a case for the tier they need to be in. It is the opinion of the Graduate Studies personnel that it would become a logistical nightmare to try and do this on a student-by-student basis. If you take a look at your program and see 50% of your students are using lots of resources, and 50% of your students are using very little resources, then you might want to make a case for the 2-unit or middle tier.

Q: Why wouldn't a program want to make an argument for the lowest tier?

A: They can do that, but the idea is that there are actual costs to the department.

Q: However, if you read it, the money doesn't come back to the department?

A: Actually, the details of what will come back to the department are still TBD.

Q: As it is written now, it doesn't come back to the department.

A: It goes back to the college.

Q: Could you clarify under item 2, lines 80 and 81, why that sentence is in there?

A: Essentially, if a student gets an RP or an I grade, they are not finished with the degree, so they continue to be students of the university and they are still working on what they need to complete.

Q: Is it possible to automatically establish that a department gets a 1290 class instead of all of us having to go establish them?

A: It is important for the protection of the student that there be some kind of review to determine which level is the appropriate level.

Q: On lines 80 and 81 it refers to a student having up to the last day of the semester to submit their work. So if the student isn't graduating that semester and they turn in their work on the last day of the semester, is this implying they are paying for the fall, but graduating in the spring?

A: The intent is not to make the student pay for an additional semester if they have finished all their work. The intent is if the student is not done with all their work and needs additional supervision, then the student must register for another semester.

Q: If I have a student that is going to do 3 units in the fall and 3 units in the spring, do I have to give them a RP in the fall because they are not quite done?

A: For a thesis you are not supposed to give credit until the thesis is done.

Q: There was a memo sometime back from Graduate Studies saying that students could get more than 6 units of RP and this seems to imply that they are now being limited to 6 units again?

A: No, if there is a reason a student wants to remain in regular session units, they can register for them and not the special session 1290 class. They can continue to register for the 298 and 299 classes, and pay the higher fees. However, you cannot do a third of your graduate units in 298 and 299 units.

Q: This strikes me as a little bit complicated. I'm looking at the three tiers here. I'm wondering if the difference here isn't really between a lab-based program vs a non lab-based program. The numbers of times faculty work with students could depend on the faculty member and could look very different. The cost issue seems to really be a materials cost and there might be a simpler way.

A: It is a fair point and we discussed this. On the other hand, you could say each and every faculty member on each and every thesis has to make a proposal on how much each thesis would require in time and resources. We weren't willing to go that way. This is a middle ground.

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

The original discussion on this item started two years ago. I&SA wanted to modify the policy in such a way that faculty could not schedule final exams before the final exam period/or during dead day. The current I&SA Committee decided that a final exam is the appropriate culminating experience for many courses. The policy we are recommending ensures that you have to have some sort of final evaluation in each class. This does not mean that a student has to sit down and have a discussion on final exam day, but there must be some sort of culminating experience due during the final exam period, and not during a regular day of class. If you are giving a final exam it must be during the final exam scheduled time, and if you are giving some other type of culminating experience you cannot have a due date prior to the beginning of final exams.

Questions:

Q: If for example you are assigning a take home exam, under this policy it could be due not at the time of your final exam, but any time during the time final exams take place?

A: The policy says no earlier than the first day of the final exam period. It would be up to the discretion of the faculty member. The current policy says that if you are giving a final it must take place at the final exam time, if you are doing something else you must meet with the class at the final exam period and discuss some aspect of whatever the final project happens to be. The current policy is silent on the specifics of take home exams.

Q: The way in which my department has always interpreted this is that whatever kind of final exam/project is given it cannot be due earlier than the normal time the final exam would be given. This spread out the workload for students so that every student didn't have all exams due the first day.

A: The concern on the part of many people on the committee was that if you found that the final exam time for your course was the final day of final exams, you would only have 1 ½ days to possibly review and grade the papers.

Q: What is the current enforcement if a faculty member doesn't schedule the exam when it is supposed to be? What will happen as far as enforcement for the new policy?

A: The deans have oversight of this. Our enforcement mechanism in the new policy is no worse, but the reality is that a final exam and sitting around for several hours doing nothing isn't the best use of time. This policy at least decriminalizes existing behavior.

Q: If you have a 30-page paper and that ends up at the end of the final exam period, you can ask the dean to change the date for your final exam. I think the cost of that vs having every paper due the first day of the exam period could be catastrophic for the student. The requirements for the dates are very useful and there are ways to move those dates.

A: We are not requiring that things be due on the first day. We can encourage some language that asks faculty to spread out the exams and due dates.

Q: I would support that you consider how papers are actually scheduled during final exams. This policy allows for say 4 papers to be due on the first day, and if I have an actual in-class final, I might have to accommodate the fact that a student has 4 papers due that day.

A: This policy gives preference to actual in-class final exams over other culminating experience, so the paper would have to be rescheduled.

Q: Does this mean a faculty member can change the date of the final two weeks from the final to the first day of finals? Also, in line 50, are we saying that the 298 and 299 classes do not have culminating experience?

A: Those 298 and 299 classes are currently exempted. Our syllabi policy protects students from the egregious changing of due dates.

Q: This policy states that department chairs will oversee culminating activity and this seems broad and I'm not sure how a chair would oversee this?

A: This language echoes what is in the existing policy except it changes responsibility from the dean to the chair. The committee felt chairs are more likely to know what is going on in the department and more likely to know what is curricularly appropriate in their field.

Q: Around line 57, there is a Part A about performance. Does this apply to the physical education process?

A: Is it impractical for you to complete a culminating activity in the 2 hours and 20 minutes of exam time?

Q: In some cases yes.

A: Then if this passes the faculty member should approach his/her chair and see what should be done.

Q: How are online classes addressed in this document? All online classes are anchored in the schedule per other classes as to whether they are synchronous vs asynchronous.

A: Whether it is a synchronous or asynchronous online class it has a final exam and the final exam, has a date and that is when the final exam should be scheduled.

Q: I would like there to be some discussion as to whether this is how SJSU wants to handle asynchronous classes.

E. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –

Senator Peter presented *AS 1632, Policy Recommendation: Amendment B to S15-6, Appointment of Regular Faculty Employees; Composition of Recruitment Committees (Final Reading)*. Senator Peter presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to strike the words “a minimum of” on line 59. **The Senate voted and AS 1632 was approved as amended (37-0-1).**

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

A. Vice President for University Advancement – None

B. CSU Statewide Senators – See ASCSU Chair comments.

C. Provost – None

D. Vice President of Finance and Administration –

VP Faas encouraged Senators to go down to the Event Center during one of these pantry events that VP Blaylock has and see the people there. The people getting these donations are dressed exactly like you are dressed today. There was no one in that line that looked like they didn't have a piece of clothing to their name. This hunger problem is invisible to us. You can't see who really needs help and who doesn't need it. When you see 569 students waiting to get food, you know we have a problem. We are just now stepping up to the challenge of dealing with this issue.

The number one concern of fourteen out of fifteen groups in the Campus Climate Survey was campus safety. VP Faas has been working on a number of security changes since he arrived six months ago. Just recently VP Faas attended the security night walk. About fifteen people went on the walk. There was nothing overly serious, but there were some lighting, skateboard, landscaping, and fencing issues. Every three weeks VP Faas meets with his staff regarding campus safety issues such as bluelights, cameras, locks, and even clocks on the wall in classrooms. VP Faas is working through them one-by-one.

UPD is authorized to have 32 officers on their staff, and this is up from 28 last year. We have two in the academy right now. VP Faas and his team are making progress and addressing many issues, such as comparable pay for police officers in UPD. UPD has a safety escort program and anyone including faculty, staff, and students can be escorted by UPD to their vehicles. There are 16 or 17 cadets that are available to walk you to your vehicle. UPD also just setup a Chief's Student Advisory Board. This board is composed of students working with UPD and getting involved in solving safety issues. VP Blaylock was at the first meeting and thought it went very well as did Chief Decena.

VP Faas and his staff continue to work on the walkways. There is a lot of construction going on across campus and there will continue to be a lot of construction going on as this is an old campus. One thing VP Faas has looked at is the fencing. Traditionally, fencing has had wind areas so that the wind won't blow the dirt around a construction site. What VP Faas and his team have done is to remove the fencing around the corners so that you can see the other side as you approach the corner. This helps to limit the blind spots.

Also, many dead trees have been removed. Anytime a tree is taken down, a new tree is planted.

VP Faas and his team are also working on some safety options for the MLK Library. Many students don't feel safe in the library after hours. VP Faas and his team are looking for ways to secure the upper floors of the library in the evenings for university students and personnel.

Another project is improving lighting on South Campus. There have not been problems with tailgating this year. That is partially because of the approach UPD is taking, and partially due to attendance.

Questions:

Q: With the recent surge in stairwell and stairway gropings, cameras seem like something to consider. Are you considering any additional cameras?

A: We are continually adding more cameras on campus. However, it is important to us that these cameras are only being used for UPD purposes. They are not going to be used to monitor work. Also, the storage of tape is expensive. UPD is trying to decide what is the appropriate thing to do. Signs will be put up where cameras will be used.

Q: Who is watching these cameras?

A: UPD

Q: Having our officers out walking around and interacting with students, faculty, and staff would go a long way in easing fears on campus. Unfortunately, it has been years since I've bumped into one on campus. Are there any plans to increase the foot patrols?

A: UPD went to the fraternities and spoke with them to be sure that the activities during things like Rush week were safe and so far this year there has been a big decrease in incidents. I agree with you that having a proactive approach goes a long way in decreasing incidents. This is why we are working to hire more cadets so we can get them out on rounds. However, I don't want them to be seen too much. It makes people very uncomfortable when there is too much of a police presence.

E. Vice President for Student Affairs –

VP Blaylock distributed a flyer on the mobile food pantry. Last week Student Affairs had their second pantry activity on campus. At the last event VP Blaylock reported to the Senate, that they had 349 students and just over 80 volunteers. This time the truck broke down on the way to campus. Student Affairs had to rush out to get a new truck. Students were already lined up at the Event Center waiting, and while it ordinarily takes two hours to setup, the volunteers set a record with a 17-minute setup. There were over 90 volunteers that served 569 students in 1 hour and 15 minutes. VP Blaylock got promoted from the Broccoli station to the Potato station. Henceforth, given the nickname VP "Spud" Blaylock by the Senate Chair.

Our student leaders are incredible. They are collecting over \$2,000 a month at our food stations across the campus from the coin boxes people are donating to. The teams of volunteers are terrific. They take the money and purchase food for the pantries, and they keep them stocked. They work very hard behind the scenes to make it work for our students.

At the next event, Student Affairs is hosting “Chopped,” in which the Provost and several faculty members have committed to a cook-off. There will be demonstrations on how to cook some of the vegetables we are distributing to students as well.

This past Friday, Student Affairs hosted the African-American College Readiness Summit. The campus hosted 548 African-American students from local high schools.

Two weeks ago, we hosted the Advancing Latino/a Achievement and Success (ALAS) Conference. There were over 2,000 students and their families here on campus. The mayor did the welcome, and there was a Latino speaker.

This past Friday we had all our local community colleges on campus. There were 78 people here that spent a day learning about the campus. This is called a Meet and Greet Summit and this was only the second time SJSU has done this. Fifty-seven percent of our enrolled students this fall came from the community colleges.

The staff of Academic Affairs raised over \$4,700 to support the student hunger fund on our campus. There are few campuses in America where the staff donate their hard earned money to ensure students don’t go hungry.

F. Associated Students President (AS) –

AS just passed a resolution in support of joining the Institute of International Education. This is an international consortium in support of student refugees that provides scholarships.

AS also passed a resolution in support of Santa Clara County’s Measure B.

The third resolution passed by AS was in support of “Indigenous People Day.” AS is asking the university to recognize Indigenous People Day instead of President’s Day.

AS issued a statement of solidarity with the Lakota Sioux tribes fighting against the Dakota Access pipeline. AS is asking for the support of the university and the CSU system.

AS is currently looking at the ways the Student Success Excellent in Technology Fee (SSETF) contributes to Athletics. There is currently \$5.4 million that is not being distributed in the SSETF and AS is looking into ways this could be distributed more equitably among the other groups the IRA goes to.

AS just held their 2016-2017 AS Scholarship Awards Banquet. AS gave out \$82,000 in scholarships to students that demonstrated leadership and have been involved on campus.

AS has started discussions about the proposed CSU tuition increase and ways to create programming and engage our students.

Students really appreciate the support when faculty attend their events and also appreciate the faculty members that take time to discuss the election results in their classes.

IX. Special Committee Reports – None

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Senate Executive Committee Meeting
November 14, 2016
12-1:30 ADM 167

1. Lunch
2. Approval of 10/31/16 meeting minutes
3. Consent Calendar
4. Election Calendar
5. Post-Election Diversity-SoS-(Ken Peter)
6. Policy Committee Updates
 - a. PS
 - b. C&R
 - c. O&G
 - d. IS&A
7. Updates
 - a. Provost
 - b. Administration and Finance
 - c. Associated Students

Executive Committee Meeting
November 14, 2016
12-1:30 pm ADM 167

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

1. Approval of 10/31/16 meeting minutes
 - a. Approved (12-0-0)
2. Consent Calendar
 - a. No dissent
3. Changes to the Election calendar
 - a. Approved (12-0-0)
4. Post-Election Diversity-SoS-(Ken Peter) Sense of the Senate resolution presented by Senator Peter.
 - a. AS 1636, Sense of the Senate Resolution Reaffirming SJSU's Commitment to an Inclusive Campus Climate and Our Determination to Provide a Safe, Supportive and Welcoming Environment for all our Students, Staff, Faculty, and Administrators (Final Reading). Senators Lee and Schultz-Krohn proposed amendments that were friendly to the body.
 - b. Reaffirms commitment to diversity: S01-13
 - c. The Executive Committee voted and AS 1636 was approved (12-0-0).
 - d. Consideration of having the Sense of the Senate sent to the entire faculty
 - e. Discussion of having staff vote
 - f. Discussion about having a general vote on the Sense of the Senate as a referendum
 - g. This would be a separate vote and not sent in combination with the Constitutional Amendment regarding change in membership on the Academic Senate
5. Policy Committee Updates
 - a. PS – Sense of the Senate Resolution
 - b. C&R – Provided updates on the referrals for C & R
 - i. Briefly reviewed RSCA policy
 - ii. Curriculum Policy and Processes
 - iii. Graduate ULGs initial development has shifted to the GS&R committee

- c. O&G
 - i. See email message
 - ii. Membership issues had a first reading, administrator membership
 - iii. Bylaw amendment to remove the VP for Advancement and add the Chief Diversity Officer
 - d. IS&A
 - i. Approved a process for graduate continuous enrollment, tiered system for continuous enrollment of graduate students regarding the rates charged to students
 - ii. Working on the final examination/project
6. Updates
- a. Provost
 - i. Paul Cascella appointed as Interim Dean of College of Education
 - ii. Updates on searches for Dean
 - iii. Chief Operations Manager – internal search
 - 1. James Lee
 - 2. Shannon Rose Riley
 - b. Administration and Finance
 - i. Second Harvest food event held today – long lines and great student need
 - ii. DMH – moving forward
 - iii. Search moving forward for AVP of Facilities, candidate identified
 - iv. Table top for emergency preparedness on Dec 7th
 - v. What is happening from a security perspective, website for police that is user friendly and will list recent events, looking at what events would be an alert for the entire campus community
 - vi. Campus safety looking at environmental issues to promote campus safety
 - vii. Discussions regarding lighting around campus and hiring of additional campus police
 - c. Associated Students
 - i. Poverty Under the Stars
 - ii. Proposal to have a bicycle repair station
 - iii. Student statement regarding athletics and the instructionally related activities (IRA)
 - iv. Look at SSETF – looking at unallocated funds and additional base funds to be used, committee comprised predominantly of students
 - v. Students came to AS to discuss how they feel unsafe
 - vi. Passed indigenous peoples day

- vii. National Day of Action for a No Pipeline in North Dakota
- viii. Students very appreciative with the connections between Second Harvest and SJSU

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

These minutes were taken by the Associate Vice Chair, Winifred Schultz-Krohn, on November 14, 2016, and were edited by Chair Michael Kimbarow on November 22, 2016. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on November 28, 2016.

Consent Calendar

7-Dec-16

Committee	Last Name/First Name	Term	Phone	Seat/College
Sustainability Board	Piper, Candice			Advancement
Sustainability Board	Rodriguez, Luis Cervantes			AS Director of Community and Environmental Affairs
Sustainability Board	Aubel, Patricia			Student

Athletics Board Nominees:

REMOVE:

ISA	Laura Sullivan-Green
Sustainability Board	Drury, Robert
Sustainability Board	Davis, Jennifer

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

47 and participate. All faculty may then vote by secret ballot (proportional
48 votes for part-time faculty, as provided below) on all candidates proposed
49 and willing to serve. The name or names of those receiving a majority vote
50 of the regular (tenured and probationary) faculty shall be forwarded to the
51 President via the College Dean as the nominee(s) of the department. A
52 statement of the vote of all faculty, broken down into two categories – vote
53 by regular faculty and by temporary faculty, including the actual number of
54 votes cast in each category - will be forwarded to the President via the
55 College Dean for information.
56

57 Rationale: A number of voting related issues have arisen over the intervening years
58 following implementation of F02-4. These include consideration of the various
59 procedures employed in academic departments for such issues as curricular changes,
60 operating policies, determinations of what issues require formal or informal votes by
61 faculty, implications of appointment fractions, and the opportunities as well as the
62 limitations of electronic voting resources. This proposed update to the departmental
63 voting rights policy seeks to provide greater clarity and guidance on such issues. In
64 addition, as revisions were made, voting guidelines found in both the Senate
65 constitution (Article II section 3c) and bylaws (1.7) were taken into consideration.
66

67 Retention of section 1.a. of F02-4 is needed to temporarily bridge the gap between
68 rescinding F02-4 and update of S14-8 (selection & review of department chairs).
69 Subsequently the revision of S14-8 will contain all information regarding department
70 chair nomination and selection procedures.
71

72 Note: Regarding department chair assignments, the current CSU/CFA Agreement
73 states that:
74

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

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

80 20.32 Such department chairs shall be appointed by the President and shall serve at
81 the pleasure of the President.
82

83 Approved: 12/5/16
84 Vote: 9-0-0
85 Present: Shifflett, Rajkovic, Higgins, Boekema, Laker, Ormsbee, Hart, Tran,
86 Grosvenor
87 Absent: Curry, Bailey, Boylan-Ashraf
88 Financial Impact: Depending on decisions regarding tools for online voting, one-time
89 costs for the purchase of software can be expected.
90 Workload Impact: Potential reduction as a result of the clarification of processes and
91 potential prevention of time consuming corrections resulting from
92 inappropriate procedures.
93

Departmental Voting Rights

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

1. Definitions

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

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

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

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

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

2. Department Faculty Voting

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

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

2.2.1. Given variations in the culture, history, and composition of departments with regard to tenure density, differences in the extent to which lecturers will be engaged in decision making are expected. In establishing departmental guidelines/bylaws pertaining to matters which lecturers vote on, departments

140 might take into consideration a range of issues including, but not limited to, years
141 of experience, terminal degrees and other qualifications, entitlements, years of
142 service in the department, and appointment level (e.g., .2, .5, 1.0)

143
144 2.2.2 Departmental voting rights, when granted, take effect at the beginning of
145 the next semester (fall or spring) and remain in effect until departmental voting
146 guidelines/bylaws are modified. When department guidelines/bylaws pertaining
147 to departmental voting are modified, the changes go into effect at the beginning
148 of the next semester.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

192
193 3.3.1 Departmental voting rights, when granted, take effect at the beginning of the
194 next semester (fall or spring) and remain in effect throughout the faculty member's
195 service in the department.

196
197 3.4 Leaves. Tenured and tenure track faculty members on an approved leave retain
198 departmental voting rights.

199
200 3.5 Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP). Faculty participating in FERP retain
201 departmental voting rights. They retain a full vote regardless of their academic
202 assignment in a given semester.

203
204 3.6 Tenured and tenure track faculty suspended under article 17 (Temporary
205 Suspension) of the bargaining agreement (CBA) retain their departmental voting rights.
206 ~~Tenured and tenure track faculty suspended without pay under article 19 (Disciplinary~~
207 ~~Action Procedure) lose their departmental voting rights during the term of their~~
208 ~~suspension.~~

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

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

216 217 **4. Departmental Voting Rights for Lecturers**

218
219 4.1 Lecturers can participate in votes on departmental matters excluding those
220 entrusted to tenured and tenure track faculty by department guidelines/bylaws (per 2.2
221 above) or university policy. Lecturers can choose not to exercise their voting rights (not
222 vote).

223
224 4.2 Lecturers have proportional voting rights in the department(s) in which they serve
225 equal to the proportion of time they are teaching in the department(s), not to exceed 1.0
226 in any department.

227
228 4.3 Proportional voting rights of lecturers may fluctuate with fall and spring
229 appointments.

230

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

234
235 4.5 Lecturers suspended under article 17 (Temporary Suspension) of the CBA retain
236 their departmental voting rights. ~~Lecturers suspended without pay under article 19~~
237 ~~(Disciplinary Action Procedure) lose their departmental voting rights during the term of~~
238 ~~their suspension.~~

239
240 4.6 Departmental voting rights of lecturers are suspended for any semester in which the
241 individual holds a full-time administrative (i.e. MPP), or other full-time non-faculty
242 position, in the university.

243
244 4.7 Departmental voting rights of lecturers end upon termination of employment or
245 retirement.

246
247 **5. Department Chair Voting Rights.**

248
249 5.1 As primary steward of a department, the permanent department chair has full voting
250 rights in the department they chair during their term regardless of the level of
251 assignment (i.e., 0.4, 0.6).

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

257
258 **6. Visiting faculty, students, staff, and other non-faculty voting rights.**

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

263
264 **7. Voting Methods and Procedures.**

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

271
272 7.1.1 Because of the importance of deliberations in resolving conflicts and
273 determining policies, proxy and absentee voting on departmental matters is
274 permissible only if authorized by a specific departmental guidelines/bylaws.

275

276 7.1.2 Any selected method must include a process for verifying the proportion and
277 eligibility of those voting, and provide the option of a vote to 'abstain'.
278

279

280

281 7.2 If the Department does not have an established voting procedure at the time a
282 decision is to be made, a vote by secret ballot conducted by the department or
283 committee chair shall be the default practice.

284

285 7.2.1 When a vote has been by secret ballot, the method used and the reporting of
286 results must be done in such a way as to not reveal the identity of voters even to the
287 chair.

288

289 7.3 Within departmental committees, faculty members can decide what process they will
290 use for decision making (~~e.g., formal votes, consensus, secret ballots~~)
291

6
7 **Policy Recommendation**
8 **Modification of Bylaw 2.2 Pertaining to the Term Length for**
9 **Senate Chair**

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

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

17
18 Whereas: The Senate regularly agrees to the proposal for extension and has done
19 so for nearly two decades, therefore be it

20
21 Resolved That sections a, b, c, and d of bylaw 2.22 be modified as provided in this
22 policy recommendation, and be it further

23
24 Resolved: That implementation would commence with the next election of a Vice
25 Chair of the Senate.

26
27
28 Rationale: This modification updates current bylaws in a way that recognizes the
29 historical record of actions in the Senate with respect to extending the term of the Chair
30 to two years. This modification furthers effective leadership through providing stability at
31 the outset with regard to the length of service of the Senate Chair. A Senate chair who
32 is incoming for two years can potentially engage in more effective long-term planning,
33 provide more stability, and also contribute from a more stable position to the success of
34 the SJSU campus.

35
36
37 Approved: 12/7/16

38 Vote: 9-0-1

39 Present: Hart, Grosvenor, Laker, Shifflett, Curry, Boylan-Ashraf,
40 Higgins, Rajkovic, Ormsbee, Boekema

41 Absent: Tran, Bailey

42 Financial Impact: None expected

43 Workload Impact: No change from current situation.

44
45
46

47 Modification to bylaw 2.22

48

49 2.2 Election Procedures for Senate Officers

50

51 2.21 Senate officers, other than the Chair, Past Chair and Faculty-at-Large
52 Representative, shall be elected from the faculty members of the Senate annually for
53 one-year terms. Nominees for Chair of Professional Standards must be tenured full
54 professors.

55

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

57

58 b) The Vice Chair will be elected for a term of two years and automatically succeed to
59 the office of Chair at the adjournment of the last Senate meeting of the spring semester
60 in which the Chair's term ends. If the Chair serves for one year, the vice chair will
61 succeed the chair at that time and begin his/her two-year term. In such a case an
62 election will be held to elect a new vice chair, and the term of the new vice chair will be
63 two years. If a Chair leaves their position mid-year, the vice chair will assume the duties
64 of the chair and begin their term as chair at the conclusion of that academic year. In
65 this case an election in the spring semester will be needed to select a new vice chair
66 whose term will be two years.

67

68 c) The Chair, at the conclusion of their term will serve for one year as Past Chair. In
69 alternate years, as needed, when there will be no past chair, a faculty-at-large
70 representative shall be elected at the end of spring semester to fill the Past Chair's
71 position on the Executive Committee for the following year. The Past Chair (or faculty-
72 at-large) representative on the Executive Committee will serve as the Senate's
73 representative on the Library Board.

74

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

76

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

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

14
15 Whereas: The Senate's Executive Committee needs to include members of the
16 administration whose work most directly intersects with the development
17 of university policy, and

18
19 Whereas: The evolution of the role of the Vice President for Advancement has led to
20 the need for extensive off campus engagements, and

21
22 Whereas: Issues related to campus diversity remain central to our ability to create
23 and sustain a welcoming environment for faculty, staff, students, and
24 administrators, therefore be it

25
26 Resolved That bylaw 4.1 be modified as follows:

27
28 . 4.1 The Executive Committee shall be composed of all Senate officers
29 (as defined in bylaw 2), the President, the Provost, the Vice President for
30 Administration and Finance, the Vice President for Student Affairs, the
31 Vice President for Advancement, the Chief Diversity Officer, and the
32 President of the Associated Students. For purposes of these bylaws, the
33 elected members of the Executive Committee are the Senate officers. 

34
35 Rationale: This change to the representation of administrators on the Senate Executive
36 Committee is recommended to best meet the needs of the Senate leadership to have
37 ongoing dialogue with the administrators most directly connected to the work of the
38 Senate. Information from the VP for advancement can still be obtained through
39 reporting to the Senate and Executive Committee. In addition, the senate and the new
40 chief diversity officer will benefit significantly from direct participation of the person in
41 this role on the Executive Committee.

42
43 Approved: 11/14/16
44 Vote: 11-0-0

45 Present: Laker, Curry, Shifflett, Rajkovic, Higgins, Ormsbee,
46 Boekema, Hart, Boylan-Ashraf, Tran, Bailey
47 Absent: Grosvenor
48 Financial Impact: None expected
49 Workload Impact: No change from current situation.

1 San José State University
2 Academic Senate
3 Curriculum and Research Committee
4 December 12, 2016
5 First Reading
6

AS 1641

7 **Policy Recommendation**
8 **Amendment A to University Policy S16-14:**
9 **Clarification of ‘Internship’**

10

11 **Legislative History:** Amends S16-14
12

13

14 **Rationale:** Since the passage of this university policy in Spring 2016, the campus
15 has received additional clarification from the Chancellor’s Office
16 regarding which internships require University-Organization
17 Agreements (UOA).

18

19 **Resolved:** That the following amendments be adopted immediately.

20

21 **Whereas:** CSU Executive Order 1064 “...recognizes the beneficial educational
22 purpose of student internships, as well as the need to maximize the
23 educational experience while mitigating the risks to participants and
24 minimizing the university’s liability exposure;” and furthermore
25 requires each campus “to develop, implement, maintain and publish a
26 student internship policy...;” and

27

28 **Whereas:** Internship is defined as “...an off-campus activity designed to serve
29 educational purposes by offering experience in a service learning,
30 business, non-profit, or government setting” and as further defined by
31 the Chancellor’s Office as excluding teacher preparation placements or
32 clinical placements such as nursing, counseling, physical therapy or
33 occupational therapy and including practicum courses where students
34 work in settings off-campus; and

35

36 **Whereas:** SJSU provides significant opportunities for internships, service learning,
37 and community engagement in many departments (the majority of SJSU
38 departments offer either service learning or internships), some of which
39 are credit bearing or are degree requirements and are therefore covered
by Executive Order 1064; and

40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79

Whereas: CSU Executive Order 1064 requires a student internship policy governing internships where the university makes the placement (e.g., instructor provides the site(s) from which students must choose their internship, service learning, or off-campus experience); and

Whereas: An ad hoc committee with representation and input from three university divisions, Administration and Finance (Contracts and Purchasing; and Risk Management), Student Affairs (Career Center), and Academic Affairs (Center for Community Learning and Leadership and Graduate and Undergraduate Programs) worked for 4 years on the development of this policy and University-Organization Agreement (UOA), and a larger ad hoc committee (IFAC, Internship Faculty Advisory Committee) created in Fall 2014, including additional representation from the seven academic colleges, has given input on all aspects of this policy and the UOA; therefore be it

Resolved: That a University-Organization Agreement (UOA) template be created, consistent with the CSU system requirements, and overseen and maintained by the Office of Student and Faculty Success and designated offices (e.g., Center for Community Learning and Leadership; CCLL) and when changes are needed in the standard UOA template (not the modifications at the department/program level), these changes will be reviewed and approved by the University Curriculum & Research Committee; and be it further

Resolved: That a department and/or college will utilize the standard UOA template for Internships, Service Learning, and Off-Campus Learning Experiences where the university makes the placement, but can modify it, as needed, in consultation with Administration and Finance (e.g., Contracts and Purchasing, Risk Management) and the Office of Student and Faculty Success; and be it further

Resolved: That if departments/programs permit students to seek their own internships for a degree requirement, the department/program will need to provide at least one option to students where the university makes the placement that will then require a UOA; be it further

Resolved: That if an internship is an elective for a degree program, it should be clear (i.e., through catalog description, advising, and other program

- 80 materials) to the student that he/she will make their own placement and
81 no UOA will be required; be it further
82
- 83 **Resolved:** That when a student makes his or her own internship arrangements, the
84 student must sign a self-placement declaration on the Learning Plan
85 stating that the university did not make the placement and that the student
86 be made aware that the learning site is not covered in terms of liability, but
87 that the student is covered by CSU credit liability insurance (i.e.,
88 SAFECLIP), so long as the student is in good standing while completing
89 the internship and registered/enrolled in a course that requires internship
90 experience; be it further
91
- 92 **Resolved:** That the student's individual Learning Plan (LP) and Participation
93 Guidelines (PG) be created at the department level to ensure that the
94 non-SJSU learning site, the faculty member coordinating and
95 overseeing the internship, service learning, or off-campus experience
96 and the students involved are in agreement about the nature of the
97 academic requirements and expected outcomes; and be it further
98
- 99 **Resolved:** That the LP define the course expectations and learning outcomes
100 associated with the internship, service learning or off-campus
101 experience and that the outcomes of the LP relate to the course learning
102 outcomes or the program learning outcomes; and be it further
103
- 104 **Resolved:** That the LP is provided to the employer or site supervisor providing the
105 internship, service learning, and off-campus activity; and be it further
106
- 107 **Resolved:** That full implementation of UOA, LP, and PG documents; and training
108 as necessary be developed and overseen by the Office of Student and
109 Faculty Success and designated offices (i.e., CCLL); and be it further
110
- 111 **Resolved:** That the campus, under the leadership of the Office of Student and
112 Faculty Success, investigate and implement solutions to streamline and
113 develop a simpler process for establishing agreements with partner sites
114 and develop procedures to address unique situations across
115 departments and students; and be it further
116
- 117 **Resolved:** That all learning sites be entered into the CSU database in a timely

118 fashion consistent with the development of this system-wide database,
119 and the training of SJSU faculty and staff with its implementation with
120 particular emphasis on risk management issues; and be it further

121
122 **Resolved:** That this policy be effective Fall 2016 and the UOA approval process
123 formalized by Fall 2017.

124
125
126 **Approved (C&R):** December 5, 2016

127
128 **Vote:** 11-0-0

129
130 **Present:** Anagnos, Balal, Cargill, Chang, Chung, Grindstaff, Heil, Mathur,
131 Rodan, Stacks, Trulio

132 **Absent:** Buzanski, Matoush
133

134 **Curricular Impact:** This policy will bring SJSU into compliance with the governing
135 CSU Executive Order. It will also establish procedures to
136 document that credit-bearing internships, service learning
137 courses, and off-campus learning experiences have established
138 learning goals.

139
140 **Financial Impact:** Very closely tied to the Workload Impact. In addition, a new staff
141 position in Office of Student and Faculty Success is required to
142 fulfill the UOA processes.

143
144 **Workload Impact:** Workload will involve time spent orienting students to these
145 requirements; time spent in coordination with SJSU offices and
146 the students in handling/processing the required forms (LP, PG,
147 UOA); and time spent maintaining updated information on the
148 status of these forms and our partnering organizations.

149
150 Workload impact will be closely tied to the following factors:
151 - the number of students enrolled in a given department's
152 internship program
153 - the total number of organizations at which the department's
154 students are interning
155 - the percentage of the organizations with which a department is
156 working already has a non-expired UOA on file
157 - the complexity of the UOA approval process.

7 **Policy Recommendation**
8 **Change in the Membership and Charge of the Student**
9 **Success Committee**
10

11
12 Legislative History: Rescinds S11-6 which pertains to the membership of the Student
13 Success Committee.
14

15 Whereas: SJSU has taken proactive and definitive steps to strategically tackle
16 issues related to student success through its Student Success Plan, and
17

18 Whereas: Reorganization of the student success committee in the context of the
19 Plans' initiatives and goals could facilitate progress campus wide, and
20

21 Whereas: The current structure and size of the student success committee may not
22 be the most effective arrangement with regard to the coordination of
23 efforts to improve student success or to effect changes to advance student
24 success initiatives, therefore, be it
25

26 Resolved: That the current student success operating committee be dissolved and in
27 its place constitute a special agency focused on student success, and be it
28 further
29

30 Resolved: That the membership and charge of the newly constituted Student
31 Success Committee be as proposed in this policy recommendation.
32

33 Rationale: SJSU needs a university-level committee focused on student success that
34 is populated in a way that puts key representatives together who can help
35 move initiatives forward, provide objective input on what's working and
36 what's not, and can review and recommend changes to academic policies,
37 practices, and procedures. With clear expectations about providing as
38 well as receiving input, this group can be instrumental in offering advice
39 and nurturing connections that enable all groups engaged in various
40 aspects of student success to more effectively reach common goals.
41 Constituting this group as a special agency with reporting responsibilities
42 to the instruction and student affairs policy committee would work quite
43 well and fits within the guidelines for special agencies as provided for in
44 our bylaws: "Special agencies are bodies created by policies
45 recommended by the Academic Senate which, because of functions or
46 membership, are not designated Senate committees."

47
48
49
50
51 Approved: 12/8/16
52 Vote: 9-0-0
53 Present: Laker, Shifflett, Boekema, Curry, Higgins, Rajkovic, Hart,
54 Boylan-Ashraf, Grosvenor,
55 Absent: Ormsbee, Tran, Bailey
56 Financial Impact: None expected
57 Workload Impact: Increased workload for the originating members as they establish
58 connections and determine how best to meet the elements of their
59 charge and effectively impact efforts campus-wide around student
60 success.
61
62 Membership:
63
64 AVP Transition & Retention Services
65 AVP Faculty & Student Success
66 2 Reps from Academic Affairs - appointed by VP Ac. Affairs
67 2 Reps from Student Affairs - appointed by VP Student Affairs
68 1 Graduate/undergrad student
69 1 Undergrad student
70 3 faculty (faculty apply and explain their interest/expertise; ExCom appoints)
71
72
73 Charge:
74
75 In the context of the University's strategic plan, this committee reviews and
76 recommends changes to academic policies, practices, and procedures as they relate to
77 all aspects of student success. This would include, but is not limited to, student
78 enrollment, financial aid, retention, engagement, academic skills and competencies, and
79 time to degree. The committee will assist in identifying challenges, serve as a central
80 information resource to gather recommendations and disseminate information on
81 student success policies and goals and provide advice regarding the planning,
82 development, and implementation of initiatives designed to facilitate student success.
83 Individual members are charged with the responsibility of maintaining robust
84 communications with the groups they are affiliated with. This will be critically important
85 to the group's ability to formulate sound recommendations that can shape and
86 coordinate efforts to improve student success.