

2015/2016 Academic Senate

MINUTES  
September 14, 2015

**I. The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Forty-Seven Senators were present.**

**Ex Officio:**

Present: Kimbarow, Heiden, Sabalius,  
Amante, Van Selst, Lee

**CASA Representatives:**

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

**Administrative Representatives:**

Present: Martin, Feinstein, Blaylock,  
Larochelle, Lanning

**COB Representatives:**

Present: Campsey, Sibley, Virick

**Deans:**

Present: Green, Hsu, Steele  
Absent: Stacks

**EDUC Representatives:**

Present: Mathur  
Absent: Laker

**Students:**

Present: El-Miaari, Abukhdeir,  
Medrano, Cuellar, Gay  
Absent: Sarras

**ENGR Representatives:**

Present: Backer, Sullivan-Green

**H&A Representatives:**

Present: Frazier, Bacich, Grindstaff, Riley, Khan

**Alumni Representative:**

Present: Walters

**SCI Representatives:**

Present: Kaufman, White, Beyersdorf, Clements

**Emeritus Representative:**

Present: Buzanski

**SOS Representatives:**

Present: Peter, Coopman, Curry, Wilson

**General Unit Representatives:**

Present: Matoush, Kauppila  
Absent: Medina

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

The minutes of May 11, 2015 (last minutes of 2014-2015 Senate) were approved as is (41-0-6).

The minutes of May 11, 2015 (first minutes of 2015-2016 Senate) were approved as is (39-0-8).

**III. Communications and Questions –**

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

Chair Kimbarow welcomed the Senate back from summer break.

This Senate has broken a record by having nine resolutions come to the floor on the first full Senate meeting of Fall, and if this is any indication of the year to come it will be extremely busy compared to last Fall when the Senate passed only two resolutions.

Chair Kimbarow welcomed the new Senators: Senators Martin, Blaylock, Lanning,

Hsu, Beyersdorf, Clements, and Cuellar.

Chair Kimbarow recognized the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, and informed all new Senators that they could go to Eva with any questions they might have.

Last year the Senate passed 12 new policies including the Retention-Tenure-Promotion (RTP), Writing Skills, Library, Probation and Disqualification, Priority Registration, and Sound Level policies. However, the most popular policy of all those passed last year was the Thanksgiving policy which takes effect next year and makes students the Wednesday before Thanksgiving a non-instructional day.

One policy remained unsigned from last year and that is the Credit by Exam policy. It remained unsigned due to the need to revise it to make it in compliance with CSU policy. It is coming back today for a First Reading.

The Senate passed a number of Sense of the Senate Resolutions last year and a few that stand out include the resolution that endorsed the Statement on Shared Governance and the resolution addressing the need to increase the proportion of tenured and tenure-track faculty at San José State University.

Two new national searches will be conducted this year to find the new President and the new Vice President of Finance and Administration. The Chief Diversity Officer search from last year has been extended to the end of this year, following the selection of the permanent President.

The Senate will be voting this afternoon to select the two faculty representatives that will serve with Chair Kimbarow on the Presidential Search Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees. The university is also conducting 66 faculty searches in departments across the campus.

Chair Kimbarow announced that Associated Students has filled every single committee across campus that has students on it.

When faculty, staff, students, and administration work together everything is possible and we can achieve great things. Chair Kimbarow looks forward to May 2016 when he can look back and see everything the campus community has accomplished this year.

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

President Martin announced she was thrilled to be at the first Academic Senate meeting and will try to attend as much as she possibly can. She thanked the Executive Committee for being so welcoming.

President Martin said that one of the things WASC wanted addressed is a solid leadership team. The President and the leadership team will work hard this year to get the new strategic plan for 2017 ready, as well as work on strengthening the university. President Martin will be the voice for the campus in Long Beach.

Student success is a priority for the university and we are seeing progress, but there is still work to be done. SJSU will be moving forward with searches this year, so that when the new president is selected those searches will be ready to be completed as well.

President Martin looks forward to a great year working with the Senate.

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

##### **A. Vice President of Administration and Finance–**

The Interim VP of Administration and Finance (VPAF), Josee Larochelle, announced that fiscal year 15-16 started off really well with the Governor enacting the state budget on June 24, 2015 before the July 1, 2015 start date and that is always a good thing. One of the most important things is that the state fully funded the CSU support budget. Due to the increased budget, SJSU has been able to fund additional items this year. For the campus, this means increased enrollment growth and capital outlay funds, as well as degree audit funding. Interim VP Larochelle is also working on finalizing the budget book. More information will be available soon.

Interim VP Larochelle reported, “the new capital financing framework for the CSU is a challenge and an opportunity for SJSU and the CSU. In FY 14-15, the Governor transferred responsibility for our infrastructure and capital outlay to the CSU and the campuses. What this means is that we’re responsible for our buildings. As you have seen we have built new student buildings using student fees, such as the new Student Wellness Center, and the Student Union renovation project. However, we have not had a new academic building in a long time. There was a renovation of SPX, but beyond that we have not had an infusion of funds to completely renovate our old academic buildings. Under President Martin’s leadership, we have been able to get a Science replacement building on our five-year capital plan that was presented to the Board of Trustees last week. We have significant planning that has to occur for that.

A Title IX Coordinator has been hired, Diana Epp. An email was sent to the campus today. Also, the staff representative to the Presidential Search Advisory Committee was elected by the staff and she is Hyon Chu-Yi Baker.”

##### **Questions:**

Q: Degree audit funding used to be one-time funding, has that changed?

A: Yes.

Q: When is the Student Union going to be completed?

A: Excellent question. Right now we are planning to open the renovated portion in Spring 2016.

Q: What does it mean to get the Science Building on the five-year capital plan?

A: When a project, such as a Science Replacement Building, is placed on the five-year capital plan and supported by the Board of Trustees, this is the first step for the campus to have a new Science replacement building. Funding for the project is not finalized, nor the actual program plans, which detail academic uses within the building. The CSU budget is adopted on an annual basis and is predicated upon State of California funding. As the CSU finalizes the budget for each year, the amount of CSU funding to support capital projects (like a new Science replacement building for SJSU) will be determined. We are hopeful that CSU funding will be available for the Science replacement building; however, that will not be known for potentially a few years.

Q: How was it determined to put the Science Building as the top priority given the historic placement of a revision or replacement to DMH as the first priority? How did that decision happen? How were the priorities determined?

A: The cabinet discussed major capital needs for the University over the summer, keeping in mind the new capital financing framework discussed earlier. With the change in financing authority, the Cabinet kept in mind large capital projects that would require CSU funding support. The highest priority for the University that came from those discussions was the need for a new Science building. The program planning process, which details the academic uses within the building, has not yet started and will involve the many campus groups. We need to embark on very significant and aggressive program planning of the programs and the space needs that will go into this new building. As for DMH, a DMH renovation and Addition project has been on the five-year capital program for many years. The planning process in the past for a five-year capital program did not include discussions regarding financing for projects. The five-year capital plans were submitted to the Chancellor's Office then to the State for funding and as stated previously, San José State has received very limited funding for our projects. With the change in capital financing and the authority for funding held by the CSU and the campuses, we need to align finances with projects.

[Clarification and updates after the Senate meeting from Interim VP Laroche are included in the questions and answers above and as follows: Facilities Development and Operations (FDO) is working with Academic Affairs on developing options for the University regarding DMH and in particular the heat issue.]

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

VP Blaylock announced that Student Affairs had a very productive summer. There were several orientations for freshman, international, and graduate students. Also, over 3,000 freshmen were moved into the residence halls. President Martin helped students move in as did faculty and staff. Student Affairs also had “Ask Me” tents setup where faculty and students could ask

questions for those new to the campus.

Student Affairs will match the \$250,000 that Associated Students invests in student organizations this year. In addition, Student Affairs will provide over 100 certificates to each college for a student to take a faculty member to coffee at no cost. This will help faculty and students get engaged.

**Questions:**

Q: Do you know if any of our students are affected by the fire in Lake County?

A: We have not heard of any, but the recent fire in the apartment building in downtown San José affected seven of our students and they lost all of their possessions. Prior to the next day, Student Affairs had relocated them to the residence halls and gotten them set up with student aid, and replaced all their books.

**C. Associated Students President –**

Associated Students (AS) had their retreat a few weeks ago and identified three goals for this year. First, AS will focus on restructuring their Senate to allow for student representation from every college. The second goal is to have cohesive advocacy. AS will be focusing on being a team.

The last goal is to improve communication with students and increase their knowledge of what AS does and the services they offer.

The Child Development Center run by AS was recently recognized by First Five California as one of the most prestigious child development centers in Silicon Valley.

AS handed out 15,000 Clipper Cards to students to cover their transportation. In Addition, the AS marketing department gave out over 1,000 Spartan Squad T-Shirts at the football game.

AS is currently searching for a new Director of Intercultural Affairs.

AS is preparing for Homecoming week. The search for a Homecoming King and Queen is very gender inclusive this year and SJSU may end up having a King and King, or Queen and Queen, etc.

Kelsey Brewer, our student trustee, will be visiting the campus and also serving on the Presidential Advisory Search Committee for San José State University.

**D. Vice President for University Advancement –**

VP Lanning announced that he grew up in San José, CA and this is his home. He does not plan on going anywhere soon and hopes to give some stability to

the campus.

The Tower Foundation Board Retreat is coming up on October 12-13, 2015.

The roll-out of a new branding platform has begun with the banners across campus. This is a piece of the refreshing of the image of the university. The most exciting part of this is that the students and faculty worked with University Advancement to develop the image.

Three new development officers have been hired, and searches are underway for two additional development officers.

University Advancement is in the early stages of planning for the next fundraising campaign. One thing VP Lanning wants to be sure University Advancement does is align itself with the strategic planning process, so they will not be rushing ahead with the campaign until the strategic plan is completed.

Two external individuals have been selected to be on the Presidential Search Advisory Committee—Bob Weiss and Ed Oates.

The focus this year in University Advancement is building relationships both external and internal. University Advancement's job is to advance the university's work.

**E. CSU Statewide Senators –**

Senator Van Selst thanked Vice Chair Frazier for stepping in to cover for one of the two CSU Statewide Senators that could not make the last CSU Statewide Senate meeting.

The most recent resolutions passed at the CSU Statewide Senate include a resolution supporting a Senate bill that would ban carrying concealed weapons on campus. There were also two resolutions on high school exit exam requirements. The existing high school exit exam is not aligned with the common core.

A resolution and taskforce is being considered to examine the qualitative reasoning pilot projects at the 7 community college districts that are using the Carnegie Statway sequence to meet CSU GE area B4, but which do not require students to have completed having algebra II as a prerequisite.

A series of baccalaureate degrees are being offered at the community colleges ostensibly as part of a pilot program where the community colleges promised not to overlap substantive degree content with what the CSU and UC are offering, and then proceeded to overlap substantive degree content with what the CSU and UC offer. The CSU brought this to the Community College

Board of Trustees, but they still have not interacted with the CSU since last year and are fully intent on having curriculum on the books for the Fall 2016 semester (i.e., essentially telling us that the horse has left the barn).

Another issue under consideration by Academic Senate: CSU (ASCSU) is background checks for all new employees. The issue is once the background check is done who makes the decision as to whether something that happened say five years ago matters for the position the person is applying for? Many details of implementation are unclear.

The CSU Statewide Senate is considering support for a request for an additional Board of Trustees member who would be an emeriti faculty member, but at the same time the CSU Statewide Senate is also thinking of asking for another regular faculty trustee. It is unlikely the Governor would sign off on legislation for both.

Issues surrounding the budget include the 2% compensation pool which is putting the CSU in a position where we won't be able to compete with our sister schools (CCC, UC). There are also continuing issues surrounding tenure density.

The Chancellor was asked if open presidential searches are permissible, and the Chancellor responded that open searches are permissible if the final three candidates all say yes, otherwise not.

There are also still some concerns about the quality of shared governance across campuses with many campuses experiencing tensions between faculty and administration.

#### **F. Provost –**

SJSU hired 58 tenure/tenure-track faculty this fall, and there are 66 searches underway this academic year. This is unprecedented. SJSU is also in the process of a brand new on board program, "University 101."

There is a lot of information on the Provost website including the priority plans, and information on the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Spaces. About 100 classrooms were upgraded over the summer.

The Provost and VP of Student Affairs are creating a list of all the things that are being done in relation to student success across the campus right now as part of a new Student Success Plan they are working on.

International and Extended Studies (IES) has been tasked with looking at what international student growth looks like on campus, determining what is manageable for the campus, and projecting what we can expect over the next five years.

SJSU has hired a lot of new administrators in Academic Affairs as well. Thanks to Lynda Heiden, we started a new on board program for them as well.

There is a new staff professional development program. Academic Affairs is allocating about \$60,000 this Fall, and will do another call for proposals this spring.

**V. Executive Committee Report –**

**A. Executive Committee Minutes –**

**Exec. Minutes of June 22, 2015 – No questions.**

**Exec. Minutes of July 13, 2015 – No questions.**

**Exec. Minutes of July 21, 2015 –**

Q: What is the benefit of having term limits on any position at SJSU, especially the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR)?

A: University Policy F05-2 states, “The term of the office shall be three years and may be renewed once with approval of the President in consultation with the Academic Senate Executive Committee.” There will be a policy recommendation coming from O&G to the October 2015 Senate meeting regarding the FAR. The reason for term limits is to give other people the opportunity to serve in these positions.

**Exec. Minutes of August 10, 2015 – No questions.**

**Exec. Minutes of August 24, 2015 – No questions.**

**B. Consent Calendar –**

AVC Backer presented the consent calendar. **The Senate voted and the consent calendar was approved as amended.**

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

**VI. Unfinished Business - None**

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

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

Senator Peter presented *AS 1577, Policy Recommendation, Adjusting the Timing of Performance Reviews During the Transition to the New System for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP), Amends S15-7 (RTP Procedures) (Final Reading)*.

Senator Peter presented an amendment that was friendly to change line 67 to read, “The second sentence” instead of “The final sentence.” A motion was made and seconded to approve the resolution. **The Senate voted and AS 1577 was approved as amended (47-0-0).**

Senator Peter presented *AS 1576, Policy Recommendation, Further Clarification of the Transition to the New System for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP), Amends S15-8 (RTP Criteria and Standards) (Final Reading)*. A motion was made and seconded to approve the resolution. **The Senate voted and AS 1576 was**

**approved (46-0-1).**

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

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1575, Senate Management Resolution, Modification of Undergraduate Studies Committee Charge (Final Reading)*. A motion was made and seconded to approve the resolution. **The Senate voted and AS 1575 was approved (46-0-1).**

---

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1573, Senate Management Resolution, Modification of the Academic Disqualification and Reinstatement Review Committee Membership and Charge (Final Reading)*.

Senator Frazier presented several friendly amendments. Line 11 was changed to read, “Rescinds SM-F09-2” instead of “Modifies SM-F09-2,” and then line 19 was changed to read, “That SM-F09-2 be rescinded and replaced with the following with regard to membership, titles, and charge:” Senator Frazier presented another amendment that was friendly to line 15 that changed it to read, “...reinstatement petitions, as partially set forth in S10-6, Academic Standards, Probation, and Disqualification policy, or its amendments or revisions, and.” A motion was made and seconded to return the resolution to the O&G Committee to review and incorporate these amendments, and to also review S10-6 and consider bringing one resolution back to the Senate that replaces both SM-F09-2 and S10-6. The Senate voted and the motion to return to committee with instructions was approved (47-0-0).

---

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1574, Senate Management Resolution, Dissolving the University Teacher Education Committee (Final Reading)*. Senator Backer presented an amendment that was friendly to add a second Resolved to read, “Resolved: That SM-S12-1 be rescinded.” Senator Buzanski presented an amendment that was friendly to change line 26 to remove “in time.” Senator Sabalius presented an amendment that was friendly to change line 37 to read, “Workload Impact: Slight reduction.” A motion was made and seconded to approve the resolution as amended. **The Senate voted and AS 1574 was approved as amended (47-0-0).**

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

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

Senator Mathur presented *AS 1580, Policy Recommendation, Credit by Exam (First Reading)*. The Senate approved the Credit by Exam policy at the last Spring 2015 Senate meeting, however, after the policy was passed several issues arose where the policy was not fully in compliance with CSU policy and Title V. Therefore, the resolution was referred back to C&R for additional revision. Changes to this

resolution include the complete removal of the waiver programs, and challenge exams will be run through the testing office.

**Questions:**

Q: Could you explain the procedure of how the exam goes from the instructor to the testing office, etc.

A: Over the summer, C&R met all the pertinent players including AVP Anagnos, Marian Sofish, etc. The old way was that students had to register for the course and then the department chair submitted the paperwork to the Registrar. The new way is that the student approaches the testing office, or the department, and tells them he/she is interested in challenging a course. The testing office would then contact the department chair and see if they are willing to do the challenge exam. Then all the paperwork will be handled by the testing office.

Q: Is the testing office grading the Exam?

A: No, it goes to the department.

Q: Does this policy prohibit departments from not allowing a course to be challenged?

A: No, it is up to the department whether a course can be challenged.

Q: In line 78, it calls for “28” days, is there something special about “28” days?

A: This is so that mathematically it does not fall on a weekend day.

Q: I just want reassurance that the department will have the final say in whether a course is challengeable or not?

A: The department has the final word in whether a course is challengeable or not.

Q: What about cross-listed courses, who decides? For example, the American Institutions requirement is met by about six different departments.

A: C&R did not discuss this, but we will discuss this at the next meeting.

Q: What did the policy originally say about waiver exams, and why did it have to be removed?

A: It was US1, US2, and US3. C&R eliminated it because Title V allows individual campuses to have waiver exams. Waiver exams are not for credit per se, it is a requirement that is met. In addition, the California institutions requirement has no alternative exam anywhere.

Q: What prevents every student from taking the class to see if they can't pass it first?

A: They don't have to pay for the full payment of a course, but they will have to pay for taking the exam.

Q: This is probably a lot cheaper than taking the course, so again what prevents every student from taking it?

A: The fee is very steep. Students will not want to waste several hundred dollars, and students can only take the challenge exam for a specific course one time.

Q: I believe some of the concern is that the faculty will be spending the time correcting the exam, but there is no return of funds to the department.

A: This is the way it is currently set up but we will be submitting a Course Fee Advisory Committee proposal, so that some of the funds would be coming back to the faculty member. There was quite a bit of discussion about this in C&R.

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

Senator Kaufman presented *AS 1581, Policy Recommendation, Instructor Drops in Online Courses (First Reading)*.

This is an amendment to the existing policy on drops from classes. The existing policy, S05-12, talks about the procedures for a faculty member to drop a student from a class for not showing up, but does not give any procedures for dropping a student from an online class. This amendment will add wording that talks about ways you can establish a student is attending an online class. There are three ways listed here a student can prove attendance including completing a class assignment, informing the instructor of their intent to continue in the class, or having logged three or more hours of time on the learning management system.

**Questions:**

Q: Could not completing a co or prerequisite be a reason for dropping a student?

A: I believe not having satisfied co or prerequisites is already a reason you can drop a student from a class, but it may not be in the specific wording of this policy. I&SA will look into this.

Q: Is the three hours of learning management system time activity or just logged on time?

A: The policy says “of logged time.” However, it also says with “verifiable activity.”

Q: What is the timeline for the online classes, is it an assignment done within a week? There are no timelines given.

A: This is part of the difficulty, we do not have a good definition of an online class. I suppose we could include completing the first assignment in whatever timeframe is proposed by the instructor.

A: For the College of Engineering students, we have to submit our unofficial transcripts to the professors and if you do not meet the prerequisites, they drop you immediately.

Q: In my experience as a chair, the faculty members often complain that the student comes to the first couple of classes and then doesn't come back and refuses to allow them to drop him/her from the class. Would the committee consider bringing some parity between online and in-person classes and giving more standards to in-person classes for the right to drop students.

A: I&SA will look into it.

**VIII. Special Committee Reports –**

Dr. Camille Johnson gave an update on WASC.

Last August 20<sup>th</sup>, the WASC Steering Committee submitted SJSU's report. On October 21<sup>st</sup>, WASC asked for additional documents to be submitted to them. The WASC Steering Committee then had an offsite review. This basically meant five or six of the WASC Steering Committee members in a room and the WASC auditors in their room and a discussion via the computer screen. The WASC team spent about ½ hour telling the WASC Steering Committee what else they wanted to know.

Sixteen WASC team members came to the campus from all over California. They were here for three days. They had 25 meeting sessions in those three days and met with over 90 people from the campus. They met with faculty, staff, and students in separate groups. There were 42 lines of inquiry SJSU had to address. SJSU then got seven years of accreditation.

SJSU did receive some commendations. WASC appreciated our mid-level staff leadership. WASC recognized our budget situation and issues. They also recognized that we had started early work on our five core competencies. SJSU was also the first cohort to be accredited under this new system. In fact, in 2013 the WASC handbook came out and we were accredited in 2014.

WASC will be coming back in Spring 2017. SJSU will have a mid-cycle review in Spring 2019. Then an offsite interview in 2021. Then the WASC accreditation visit will happen in Spring 2022.

WASC pointed out two problem areas and they include; our leadership issues and our campus climate. Each of these elements will be in our special report.

SJSU had to submit lots of data to WASC on GE and our progress in core competencies. The WASC Steering Committee laid out a schedule for our core competencies.

WASC provided us with the Commission Action Letter which is four pages long, and the Team Report which is 50 pages long. There are about 30 areas for us to address and about 39 criteria to review. SJSU needs to create a living document that lists areas we need to address and the progress we've made each year and keep a table of who is working on what.

There is a WASC Steering Committee meeting on October 16, 2015. WASC wanted Student Affairs to be more involved in assessment, so SJSU will be sending some of the Student Affairs staff to assessment training as we go through the process.

Another area SJSU needs to work on is increasing the presence of University Learning Goals (ULGs). These were passed over two years ago by the Senate. The ULGs have been posted on the SJSU website. However, they need to be pushed out to the campus to make them come to life. In the College of Education, Sami Monsur got the Dean to pay for post-its with the ULGs on them and they plastered the walls of Sweeney Hall with them.

The WASC Steering Committee is also working to get Deans and Chairs training on how to write their WASC reports before they have to do them in the next few years. WASC also wants the core competencies assessed near graduation.

SJSU managed to increase the response rate to the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) by 10%. This gave SJSU access to reports by college, department, and program. You can see how much writing the students are doing in your department, etc.

Student Success and Campus Climate are areas we continue working on. SJSU has to show the effect on students rather than the number of students that showed up. SJSU also has to show WASC that our action plans are being accomplished.

There are so many great things happening on campus, but we are not coordinating our efforts. The WASC Steering Committee hopes a living document will allow SJSU to track who is working on what so our efforts can be coordinated.

Over the next few years SJSU needs to support and develop the core competencies in GE and assessment. WASC would like us to assess all five core competencies close to graduation.

The Senate also needs to revisit the WASC Steering Committee composition and charge going forward, and also develop and promote University Learning Goals (ULGs).

**Questions:**

Q: How common is it for WASC to issue another visit in two years?

A: It is not that uncommon, but may be due to our circumstances e.g. governance issues last year.

Q: What is the Senate's role in addressing shared governance issues brought by WASC?

A: The hiring of the new President and the working relationship will be watched closely by WASC.

**IX. New Business –**

**Election of two Faculty to the Presidential Selection Advisory Committee**

Statements were presented by Senator Pat Backer, Dr. Noelle Brada-Williams, Senator Craig Clements, Senator Lynda Heiden, and Dr. Camille Johnson. **The Senate voted by secret ballot and Senator Heiden and Dr. Camille Johnson were elected.**

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