

## 2010-2011 Year-End Committee Report Form

**Committee:** Instruction and Student Affairs

**Chair:** Stacy Gleixner

**Chair-Elect for 2011-2012:**

Stacy Gleixner  
4-4051

**Number of Meetings held:** 14

Stacy.gleixner@sjsu.edu  
Ext zip 0082  
(Please include phone/zip/email if available)

### Items of Business Completed 2010/2011

1. The Use and Abuse of Alcohol and Other Drugs (F10-1)
2. Change of major (AS 1443: policy failed to pass)
3. Grading Symbols for Drops and Withdrawals (F10-3)
4. Repeating courses (discussed implementation of add codes for repeating courses, decided this was a practice discussion that did not require changes to policy)
5. Determination of Academic Standing (S11-1)
6. Opposition to the Implementation of Mandatory Early Start Programs (SS11-2)
7. Engaging Student Club Advisors (Discussed strategies, had guest speakers from Student Involvement, decided no policy needed at this time)
8. Academic Integrity (Discussed topic of falsifying academic record such as in transcripts, decided no changes to existing policy was needed at this time)
9. Discussed student lab fee issue (resulting from change in executive order 1054, also brought up at Exec Committee, out of scope of Univ policy because it is a CSU EO)
10. Extension of Prime Time Scheduling Period (S11-2)
11. Date grades are due (reviewed calendar, compiled info from other campuses, chose not to pursue policy changes)
12. Use of Preferred Name (reviewed current protocol, reviewed what is going on campus with other committees, and capabilities of MySJSU, , chose not to pursue policy at this time)

### Unfinished Business Items for 2010/2011

1. Mandatory Housing Policy for Frosh
2. Policy replacing Presidential directive: Time, Place, Manner
3. Scheduling Policy
4. Required registration for graduate students in RP status
5. Amendments to Advanced Priority Registration (Student Success Committee is working on this)
6. Academic Qualifications for Student Office Holders

### New Business Items for 2011/2012

1.

Please return to the Office of the Academic Senate (ADM 176/0024) by July 29, 2011.

# ISA Minutes: 8/30/10

---

**In Attendance:**, Deanna Peck, Vic Culatta, Terri Thames, Eric Armendariz, Arlando Smith, Stefan Frazier, Bill Campsey, Rich Kelley, Kevin Starks, Christina Solorzano, Tomasz Kolodziejak, Marian Sofish, Stephen Branz, Stacy Gleixner (chair), Elizabeth McGee

**Absent:** Caroline Fee, Mo Han, Sheryl Walters

**Guest:** Dr. Jason Laker

Minutes taken by Elizabeth McGee

## Introductions & Guest Speaker

The new VP for Student Affairs, Dr. Jason Laker, introduced himself to the committee.

## Alcohol Policy Draft

The draft of this alcohol policy modifies (and will eventually replace) SO2-5. Debra Griffith headed a committee that drafted this replacement policy back in June 2009. It was not referred to ISA until this summer because of questions relating to whether to include more/less on employees. It was decided to leave the employee section as is (due to union contract issues, alcohol abuse is addressed there already), and the policy was then referred to Stacy in June 2010.

It was noted on page 1 under Purpose, that “accorded” should possibly read “afforded”. Stacy will check into this.

There was some discussion on whether to make the title of the policy more positive. The title “Use and Misuse of Alcohol and Other Drugs” was favored, since illegal drugs would not cover misuse of pharmaceutical drugs.

Regarding sanctions for violations, the draft policy refers to “suspension” under IIa and IIb. It was suggested that since the University doesn’t use the term “suspension” in other policies, we might aim to be consistent with terminology currently in use (something comparable to “academic probation” and “administrative academic disqualification”. In addition, it was suggested that under IIa and IIb, that the wording be “sanctions may include but are not limited to”, and that an additional sanction, “loss of University housing”. It was also suggested deleting “social probation” since this unknown to student groups.

There was a lengthy discussion regarding alcohol consumption at events (section VI), particularly tailgating prior to games at the Spartan Stadium. The question was raised if this section should reiterate that alcoholic bev may not be consumed in open areas. A

committee member questioned whether we might be creating conditions that we can't enforce; instead we should think about how we can better educate people about this. It was suggested that tailgating be regulated better to avoid having tailgating and alcohol consumption the focus, rather than the sporting event itself. Some suggestions included opening the gates two or three hours before the start of the game (rather than five hours, as is the current practice), and prohibiting tailgating once the game has started. The idea was also suggested of having a table or station at sporting events to educate students about alcohol abuse.

The committee favored inviting other stakeholders to a future ISA meeting, including a representative from athletics, the chief of UPD, and Paul Richardson from alumni affairs. It was also suggested to talk to someone in Student Conduct to determine how pervasive the problem of alcohol abuse at sporting events is.

### Change of Major Policy

The committee reviewed the first draft of the proposed Change of Major policy. There is a table in the draft of this policy that was meant to be aligned with the text of the policy and implementation guidelines. For now, the table was removed because it doesn't match the text. It will be added at the end if it is decided that further clarity is needed.

Some of the more controversial points of this policy were discussed, e.g., students with too many units could be forced to graduate, and no second majors would be allowed.

Regarding double majors, Steve Branz indicated that some double majors are approved (especially if there's a lot of overlap between the majors). It depends how many units a student has – if he or she can do it in 150 units or less, then it's more likely to be approved.

The question was asked how a student could switch over to another degree program if he or she couldn't get a C or better in their degree program. Steve Branz would like departments to have criteria for probation and DQ from the major.

The committee was concerned that students wouldn't understand this policy, and that once it is finalized, we have to have some way to articulate it to students clearly (e.g., offer workshops).

The question was asked by one of the student committee members about the timing of applying for graduation. Marian Sofish responded that students must apply at least two semesters prior to completing their requirements. The student committee member replied that Student Services advisors are telling students 80 units.

Some revisions to the policy were emailed to the committee that addressed a number of questions the committee had on the original draft, e.g., Section 3.1 now addresses transfer students declaring a major; Section 3.3 now addresses change of major dates, etc. Regarding deadlines, one member noted that it is confusing for the students to have departments setting different deadlines. Steve countered that there are reasons why departments need the flexibility. The question was raised what do we do with students who have faced “closed doors” multiple times? In their cases, an earlier deadline would make it easier for students to regroup. Steve noted that the dates were picked because they were around registration times.

## Agenda Items for the Semester

### Referrals

- Student Fairness Committee and grading disputes: there’s no policy in place for students to dispute an instructor’s grade (student fairness versus academic freedom);
- Date that grades are due (faculty feel grades are too soon);
- WA and WB withdrawals;
- policy on when to calculate academic standing;
- “Time, Place and Manner” – students think it’s too restrictive;
- Mandatory Housing – students would like to talk about this.

Next meeting: September 13, 2010.

Remaining meetings this year: Sept. 13, Sept. 27, Oct. 4, Oct. 25, Nov. 1, Nov. 22, 2-4 p.m., WSQ 211

## ISA minutes: 9/13/10

---

**In attendance:** Stacy Gleixner (chair), Steve Branz, Bill Campsey, Marian Sofish, Mo Han, Eric Armendariz, Kevin Starks, Christina Solorzano, Tomasz Kolodziejak, Arlando Smith, Stefan Frazier, Caroline Fee, Victor Culatta, Deanna Peck

**Absent:** Rich Kelley, Elizabeth McGee, Terri Thames, Sheryl Walters

**Guests:** Paul Richardson, Alumni Relations; Frank Belcastro, SJSU PD; Carlos Garcia, SJSU PD; Debra Griffith, Student Conduct & Ethical Development; Liz Jarnigan, Athletics

Minutes taken by Stefan Frazier

**Minutes of 8/30 meeting:** Member name “Kolodziegak” should be spelled “Kolodziejak.” On p. 2, line 3, “tailgated” should be corrected to “tailgating.” Minutes were unanimously approved as amended.

**Announcement:** Starting with our next meeting, we will meet in the somewhat larger Engineering 347.

---

### Alcohol Policy

Continued from last meeting, especially in regard to tailgating at football games.

SJPD reported that the tailgating policy became more stringent last year: at the start of each game, all tailgating must cease. But there is still a long period of time before, up to 5 hours, which concerns the PD. Events, Facilities, and others make the decision about the pre-game tailgating time. Compared to other large institutions, however, our “tailgating presence” is quite low indeed. This year, for the first time, alcohol will not be allowed inside the stadium, which will lose money for Athletics, and have some unknown effect on tailgating. This year also, a new “beer garden” is being founded, outside of the stadium; discussion ensued on various issues regarding this.

It was noted that a lot of people arrive drunk at the game. Debra Griffith reported that the majority of people reported to her are underage and often have alcohol given to them by of-age adults. PD reported that one can expect 15-20 incidents of serious alcohol problems (fights, batteries, medical attention) at a big game, though the issue is not as much the volume of cases, but the type: in some cases recently, even children have been victims. Most drunkenness involves students (rather than alumni or the general public) in the PD’s estimation. In general, it is obviously not a problem limited to SJSU.

PD was asked what their recommendation would be about tailgating. They answered that it’s very hard to say “how many hours” for tailgating. They repeatedly noted, however, that any

incident depletes PD resources, taking away from the force needed if something really big were to happen (e.g. earthquake). Various other solutions were discussed, including breathalyzer tests.

To clarify the draft policy, the committee agreed to include the following two sentences in both sections III.b and III.c:

- “Exceptions to this apply for the consumption of alcoholic beverages in the parking lots of sporting facilities (tailgating), which is discussed below.”
- “This does not apply to those alcoholic beverages possessed during University-sponsored events or purchased from Spartan Shops and consumed in designated areas.”

Further discussion ensued on other sections and clauses in the draft policy. The committee agreed to strike this sentence in VII: “However, these events must comply with the educational mission of the University.”

It was decided by unanimous vote to send the draft policy to the Senate floor for a first reading.

---

### **Change of major policy**

This discussion was continued from the previous meeting. The policy draft included two sections numbered 3.0, so all relevant sections were renumbered. The numbering below reflects this revision.

A question was raised on this sentence in Sec. 4.3: “Students who apply to an impacted major but are not admitted should find an alternative major in the semester subsequent to being denied admission.” After some discussion, the policy was revised to include a new formulation of that sentence.

All references to “declaring” a major will be changed to “applying to” a major. Title was changed to “Requesting to Declare, Change, or Add a Major or Minor.”

A student member posed the question of whether students could apply to more than one major simultaneously. Discussion ensued on this, and it was agreed that further serious consideration needs to be given to this matter.

The topic of double majors (4.5.2.1) was discussed. It was decided to add to that paragraph a 15-unit maximum for units remaining on the second major. Also, a sentence was added to the effect that if the second major can’t be completed, an option to confer a minor would be possible, if appropriate and approved by the department.

Paragraph 4.5.2.2 was discussed. Everything after the phrase “) may be allowed to change to a new major” was stricken.

Meeting adjourned at 3:58, with this last topic still unfinished.

I.S.A. Minutes - Monday 9/27/10 Eng 347: 2-4pm

**In attendance:** Stacy Gleixner (chair), Emily Bauer (sitting in for Rich Kelley), Steve Branz (non-voting), Bill Campsey, Marian Sofish, Eric Armendariz, Kevin Starks, Christina Solorzano, Tomasz Kolodziejak, Arlando Smith, Stefan Frazier, Victor Culatta, Deanna Peck, Sheryl Walters, Arlando Smith, Terri Thames, Mo Han

**Absent:** Caroline Fee

**Guests:** Cindy Kato

**Minutes** taken by Eric Armendariz (A.S. Director of Student Resource Affairs)

**Change of Major**

-Time certain 2pm: Change of Major Policy (attached) Guest: Cindy Kato (Dir Student Success Services)

-Will be effective Spring 2011.

-Policy is similar to Presidential Directive

-Received legal council from Long Beach

-Will the eligibility criteria be published before the Policy is in effect?

-Discussed concerns with the appeal process.

-Appeals are made to Undergraduate Studies. Stacy will see if this is also true for graduate students.

-Discussed changing the tone of the “whereas” section.

-Action Item: Rewording.

1<sup>st</sup> Whereas: The fourth whereas will become the first whereas.

-Inquiry from Mr. Culatta about data concerning the 4<sup>th</sup> whereas regarding graduation rates from students changing majors.

-Bob Cooper found changing major once increased likelihood of graduation, changing major twice slightly increased the graduation rate of those students.

-Prof. Branz brought up the grammatical error of Whereas #4 “SJSU data has *shown*”....

- Resolves should begin with “therefore be it”....

-“120 unit is an adjusted number.”

-Deanna Peck: High unit will be a result of students not knowing where they want to be

**Section 2.0**

- Concerned about the probation and DQ students.

**Section 3.0**

-Branz: Change the term “blocked” to “restricted” (last line of section 3.0)

-Thames: Change “freshmen” to “frosh”

-concern with what will happen to the students not getting into their major.

-for most majors a student needs to take 9 units in chosen major to apply for that major.

-Stacy: Pre-requisites are clearer on the “advising hub”

**Section 4.0**

-Add a statement in the policy about advising.

4.1

- Branz: take out “/head” in “department chair/head” (first bullet point).
- Sofish: there should be more comprehensive college advising. As it stands the advising is not very strategic. There should be a panel so students could know their options.
- Starks: concerned with the spirit of the policy.

#### 4.2

- Branz: If students apply to multiple majors and gets accepted to more than one major, which major takes precedent?

- Recommends having one form that is sent to the multiple departments for approval of major.

- Strike out “Students applying to an impacted major must meet the eligibility criteria set by the department for admission to the impacted major.”

- Thames: Proposed adding section – “Whereas when state funds are reinstated and impaction is no longer necessary, then the policy will be referred back to committee (paraphrased).”

#### 4.3

- Strike out: “they will have an advising hold placed on future registrations.”

#### 4.4

- Strike out 4.4.2

##### 4.5.2.1

Add may to last sentence of section to read “If the second major can’t be completed, a minor may could be conferred if appropriate.

##### 4.5.2.2

- Reword section to clarify.

##### 4.5.3

- Add parts of this section to 4.4.2



## I.S.A. Meeting Minutes Monday 10/4/10 Eng 347: 2-4pm

**In attendance:** Stacy Gleixner (chair), Eric Armendariz, Steve Branz (non-voting), Victor Culatta, Caroline Fee, Stefan Frazier, Mo Han, Rich Kelley, Tomasz Kolodziejak, Elizabeth McGee, Deanna Peck, Christina Solorzano, Kevin Starks, Terri Thames, Sheryl Walters

**Absent:** Bill Campsey, Arlando Smith, Marian Sofish

**Guests:** none

**Minutes** taken by Stacy Gleixner

**Next meeting:** 10/25 from 2-4 in Eng 347

**Remaining meeting this semester:** 10/25, 11/1, 11/22

### Review of Minutes from 9/27/10

- Unanimously approved

### Change of Major

- Whereas edits
  - First 2 whereas were combined
  - Discussed freedom of choice/ do students have the “right” to choose their major
  - Switched last 2 whereas
- Section 1.0 added “of this policy” after sections to clarify
- Section 2.0
  - Added “declare or” to “change into the major or minor”
  - This information will be posted on the University’s Advising Hub website.
- Section 3.0
  - Clarified enrollment hold by adding “The restricted enrollment will involve an advising hold to help aid the student in finding a major.”
  - Added language on former students returning
- Section 4.0
  - 4.1
    - discussed whether we should have bulleted list or not, it is not policy (not required things a student must do) but it softens policy and makes it more student friendly, however students won’t likely read this policy
    - added “is published on the University Advising Hub website” to clarify the departments with a special deadline
  - 4.3: why limit it to two times
    - Not enforceable, we don’t track it
    - Need to limit students to prevent a student from trying for the same major over and over

- Doesn't factor in if the University messes up on an application, or they reach the requisites needed later in the major
    - Added "If they wish to apply additional times to that same major, the student must get approval from an advisor in the intended major to reapply."
  - 4.4: Discussed why 15 units
    - It is based on units not semesters because enrollment is based on units
      - Average unit load per student per semester is 11
    - The 15 unit limit may cause problems if it is not a 3 unit class
    - Added "(or 4 or fewer classes)"
  - 4.5.1:
    - Deleted "Normally, proposed changes, for compelling reasons, that can be completed within 15 units will be allowed."
    - Deleted "Students with double majors, and students unable to graduate in the currently declared major, will be managed as described in 4.5.3 and 4.5.4.", because those sections apply to both 4.5.1 and 4.5.2
    - Renumbered 4.5.3, added "regardless of their earned units" to clarify that any student who couldn't graduate in their current major would be allowed to change
- Section 5.0
  - Added "get disqualified from their current major will be reminded of SJSU's "Applying..."
- Section 6.0
  - Struck 6.3 and 6.4 as they don't apply to a change of major
- Created a section 7.0 on appeals

Instruction and Student Affairs Committee  
Minutes from 10-25-10

**Present:** Eric Armendariz, Stephen Branz, Bill Campsey, Victor Culatta, Caroline Fee, Stacy Gleixner (chair), Rich Kelley, Tomasz Kolodziejak, Elizabeth McGee, Deanna Peck, Arlando Smith, Marian Sofish, Christina Solorzano, Kevin Starks, Sheryl Walters

**Absent:** Stefan Frazier, Mo Han, Terri Thames

**Minutes taken by:** Deanna Peck

1. Minutes from 10-4-10
  - a. Minutes unanimously approved with Elizabeth McGee added to attendance list
2. Time, Place & Manner
  - a. Challenge
    - i. Want to include more locations
    - ii. Policy vs. practice is different and needs to be clear and consistent
    - iii. Election space/advertising space very limited - needs to have more
    - iv. Hard to get spaces for programming
  - b. Possible solution
    - i. Perhaps make a plea to the president's office rather than going to academic senate
    - ii. Need to put a formal specific document together so that there can be a response
    - iii. Consider thinking about getting electronic kiosks in conjunction with new construction
    - iv. Perhaps try to get a block of time that is designated for engagement
    - v. Think in terms of decibel limits
  - c. AS students will bring a possible draft for review on Monday, November 22<sup>nd</sup>
3. Changing of WA/WB grading symbols
  - a. History of policy explained by Steve
  - b. We don't want WB to count in limits that students have
  - c. What's the difference between WA and WB -
    - i. WB is more serious and compelling
    - ii. WA cannot be given after 80% of the term
  - d. Vote to bring to senate - unanimous
4. Repeating Courses
  - a. Steve gave history
  - b. Policy wants process to be done manually for third try of taking the class
  - c. 250 petitions have already been turned in each semester for the 3<sup>rd</sup> try
  - d. 2<sup>nd</sup> whereas needs to be re-worded -
  - e. Why does this have to come to the Senate?
  - f. Discussion regarding how instructor's offer add codes
  - g. Vote - does not need to go to Senate - 2 abstains
5. Calculation of Academic Standing

- a. Steve gave history
  - b. Need the policy to systematize everything and not just one part
  - c. Registrar thinks proposal is not doable and feasible
  - d. Pros and Cons discussed
    - i. Will help some students
    - ii. Will hurt some students
    - iii. Students should be evaluated all 4 terms
    - iv. Students can get DQd after just one class because DQ is based on Term GPA and not SJSU Cum. GPA
  - e. This needs to make things clearer - policy and practice need to be aligned
  - f. Stacy will bring a new revised policy next week
6. Dates that grades are due and posted
- a. Faculty want grades due later and posted right after they enter
  - b. End of instruction 12/11; Grades due from faculty two days after last final; typically registrar sets an extra deadline during the fall semester;
  - c. End of instruction 5/27; Grades due from faculty two days after last final - there is no grace period in the Spring semester
  - d. Grade submission deadlines set by academic calendar
  - e. Lots of information/processes have to follow grades for Spring
  - f. Challenge of why we have winter sessions and summer sessions so close to the end of other semesters
    - i. Students are losing because of how we are implementing these sessions
  - g. Stacy will work on challenges of schedule offline with Marian and Bill and bring back ideas to committee

## ISA minutes: 11/1/10

---

**In attendance:** Stacy Gleixner (chair), Steve Branz, Bill Campsey, Victor Culatta, Caroline Fee, Stefan Frazier, Mo Han, Tomasz Kolodziejak, Elizabeth McGee, Deanna Peck, Arlando Smith, Marian Sofish, Kevin Starks, Sheryl Walters.

**Absent:** Eric Armendariz, Rich Kelley, Christina Solorzano, Terri Thames,

Minutes taken by Bill Campsey

**Minutes of 10/25/10 meeting:** Approved 10-0-1

---

### AS 1443 – Applying to Declare, Change, or Add a Major or Minor

Chair Gleixner reported on the first reading of AS 1443 in the Senate. She stated only minor changes were suggested. In committee the following changes were made:

- Section 4.1 and 4.2 should be reversed such that the original Section 4.1 becomes 4.2 and the original Section 4.2 becomes 4.1.
- In the original Section 4.2 – now 4.1, “also” should be stricken so that the amended Section 4.1 now reads, “Students seeking a major are ~~also~~ strongly advised . . . .”
- Section 4.5 was amended from 4 or fewer to 5 or fewer. The sentence in question should read, “Generally, students who propose, with compelling reasons, a change that will require 15 or fewer additional units (or 5 or fewer classes) to graduate will be approved.”
- A similar change was proposed and accepted in Section 4.6.4. It should now read, “A decision to graduate the student without the second major will generally be made in cases where the second major was declared after Spring 2009, and/or is not part of an SJSU Catalog blended or interdisciplinary major, and/or the student has not made adequate efforts to complete both majors in a timely and efficient manner, and/or the number of units to complete the second major exceeds 15 (or ~~four~~ five or fewer classes).”
- Academic Advising and Retention Services should be added to the Workload Impaction Statement.

The committee voted unanimously to forward the revised AS 1443 to the Senate for their consideration.

---

### Determination of Academic Standing Policy

The resolve was changed to reflect more accurately actual practice, that is, **probation** **disqualification** standing will be determined only after the Fall and Spring terms.

### **Determination of Academic Standing Policy – continued**

Workload Impact will not change from current practice.

The committee voted unanimously to forward this proposed policy to the Senate for their consideration.

---

### **Opposition to the Implementation of Mandatory Early Start Programs**

Stefan Frazier gave a history of the “early start” proposal that moves the remediation in English and Mathematics to the Summer of a student’s first year at San Jose State University.

Several points of opposition were raised to the “Early Start” proposal:

- Fear that the basic courses will be “off-loaded” to community colleges rather than taught by SJSU faculty
- Concerns that many students would suffer economic hardships if forced to take summer courses rather than work

There was a lively and spirited discussion of the proposal and the suggested opposition to it. Chair Gleixner will integrate the essence of the discussion and present an amended proposal to the committee at our next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 3:48.

# ISA minutes: 11/22/10

---

**In attendance:** Stacy Gleixner (chair), Eric Armendariz, Steve Branz, Bill Campsey, Victor Culatta, Caroline Fee, Mo Han, Deanna Peck, Arlando Smith, Marian Sofish, Christina Solorzano, Kevin Starks

**Absent:** Stefan Frazier, Rich Kelley, Tomasz Kolodziejak, Elizabeth McGee, Terri Thames, Sheryl Walters

Minutes taken by Gleixner

## Minutes of 11/1/10 meeting:

- Edited minutes: probation word was changed to DQ in “The resolve was changed to reflect more accurately actual practice, that is, “disqualification” standing will be determined only after the Fall and Spring terms.”
- Approved 11-0-0

## Time, Place, and Manner

- Students are meeting in winter to put together a plan.
- They will let Stacy know of anything that needs to get looked into (such as an assembly hour) to get the policy drafted for Spring

## Determination of Academic Standing Policy

- Policy was edited to use semester terminology for Fall and Spring, term for summer, and intersession for Winter
- Registrar’s comment : winter shouldn’t be in this policy
  - Winter is always special session (intersession: IES handles registration)
  - Summer could be in policy because students graduate in summer but not winter
  - However registrar did say their policy on determining probation after winter has been inconsistent (done sometimes)
- Point was raised that the original draft (no probation or DQ determination after summer or winter) was more student friendly
  - Winter and summer are so pedagogically different from fall and spring
    - Students don’t realize what they are getting into with the condensed format
  - If they go on probation in winter or spring they can get DQed after the following semester if they also do poorly that semester so even though they don’t get DQed it has an impact on them
    - On the other hand, some students may go off probation in the summer
    - No matter what policy we put into place will advantage some and disadvantage others
  - Also, other version of policy would be clearer: probation and DQ were only determined after Fall or Spring

- Registrar's comment on workload: In Fall and Spring, registrar staff manually look over all 3000 applicants in 3 -4 days
  - Workload for summer and winter is minimal
- Point on graduate students was discussed
  - Grad students only taking one classes so summer shouldn't be treated differently for them
  - Special sessions calendar also doesn't always match up with Fall/ Spring/ Summer calendar

### Opposition to the Implementation of Mandatory Early Start Programs

- Stacy pointed out error in draft policy she sent out. It was supposed to be only the first two pages (we had decided last time we didn't need a second SSR encouraging faculty to become involved in implementation plan because our implementation plan is done and key faculty were involved)
- Steve passed out draft of our implementation plan
- Susan McClory would be good source to get data needed for 4<sup>th</sup> Whereas
- Discussed how students qualify (satisfy K-12 A-G) but don't meet ELM and EPT standards, ELM and EPT criteria are set statewide
  - This sends a message that they don't belong and put more hurdles for belonging
  - In particular, this came about as the CSU expanded their pool and started admitted more black and Latino/a students.
  - As Stefan pointed out last time, if we didn't call this remediation it would have a totally different tone
  - Added content to the third Whereas to reflect the impact on underrepresented groups
- Decided to strike last whereas referring to dislike of availability at other campuses
  - If we are voicing that it is a bad idea at this campus, then what does it matter whether they satisfy it here or somewhere else
- Voted unanimously to bring to Senate for first reading

### AS 1443 – Applying to Declare, Change, or Add a Major or Minor

- Discussed holding this for more discussion and bring in Spring
  - Steve raised an urgency point that UGS reviewing the criteria is very student friendly (section 2.0) and would solve problem he sees now about majors with some arbitrary rules excluding students (such as not allowed if been DQed in previous major)
  - It would be helpful to separate this out and
- Kenneth raised good points that students could very easily get around the change of major rules
- Intrusive advising would be more effective at accomplishing this
  - However, many departments are opposed to mandates for advising as unfunded workload
  - Also, this affects all students, not just those changing a major, and therefore is not directly relevant to a change of major policy



- Also, timing needs to be carefully thought out: advance registration happens about 2/3 way through the previous term, therefore they would need to submit their graduation plan to their advisor at the very least before the start of the previous year (mid-way through junior year) in order not to lose advance registration
- ISA really needs to look into a policy on advising
- Registrar says that only currently require chair or advisor for 90, require Assoc Dean at 120
  - This the opposite of what ISA was told, ISA was told the existing change of major form is incorrect and PD is correct
- Decided to make 4.5 be for 120 units instead of 90
  - This would get around students taking the units before they applied as at high units, AARS advising holds sets in anyway
- Strike 4.6.1
  - 4.6.2 would become 4.6
- Stacy will email revised change of major around for a vote of what to do

#### Discussion of protocol on Senate floor

- Several committee members felt they did not know how to participate fully in the Senate and found what happened on the floor confusing
- Stacy will raise this point to Chair Kauffman for maybe an overview of the procedures the floor will use

# ISA minutes: 1/31/11

---

**In attendance:** Bill Campsey, Caroline Fee, Stefan Frazier, Stacy Gleixner (chair), Mo Han, , Rich Kelley, Elizabeth McGee, Deanna Peck, Marian Sofish, Christina Solorzano, Terri Thames, Sheryl Walters

**Absent:** Stephen Branz, Tomasz Kolodziejak, Arlando Smith, Kevin Starks

**Guest:** Pauline Le, Student Involvement

Minutes taken by Stefan Frazier

## Minutes of 11/1/10 meeting:

Approved unanimously without amendments.

## Debrief of 12/16 Senate meeting

Change-of-major policy did not pass. Gleixner suggested a few theories on why this happened. In any case, the presidential directive now still stands. Still upcoming: policy on Academic Standing, and sense-of-the-senate policy on Early Start.

## Engaging Club Advisors

EO 969 now requires all student organizations to have an advisor. Five years later now, Rich Kelley suggested that we revisit this mandate, its relevance, and its effectiveness. Pauline Le showed two forms – the “advisor agreement form,” and Article VIII from the student organization constitution – and described some of the concerns that have arisen. Examples of concerns: in one case, advisor was using funds in an inappropriate manner; in another, advisor was giving undue influence on students’ election process. Thus EO 969 could be revised to more clearly delineate an advisor’s responsibilities and duties.

At minimum, all advisors should read and agree to the “advisor agreement form,” which is fairly new (from the last year). They should also be strongly encouraged to attend the leadership conference – not nearly enough of them attend – as well as to read the advisors’ handbook. They need to understand what sorts of involvement is appropriate, or not; students have noted privately that they are sometimes worried about backlash if they complain openly.

Foremost, all this needs to be communicated in the most delicate, non-offending way possible, given that advisors serve voluntarily.

It was suggested that Student Involvement meet with Academic Affairs (Charlie Whitcomb’s office) to get their blessing on any initiative they take. A concern about that may be that academic advising is different from club advising. Various other suggestions were made about how to distribute the information about the advisor forms and about advising responsibilities, including in the campus newspaper, or in direct presentations to the Council of Chairs (both university and college) – this latter because information from the associate deans doesn’t always trickle down to the chairs.

If an advisor does not actually follow the “advisor agreement form,” what can be done? Both to “discipline” the advisors in question, as well as reassure the students involved? Would a senate policy be helpful? Discussion on all these questions ensued. It was generally agreed that a policy would probably not be effective right now, since it would have to have teeth, and Student Involvement currently wouldn’t want to do “enforcement.”

### **Update on presidential directive 01-01 on “Time, Place, and Manner” (concerns from students)**

Section 5.0 “disruption”: students feel like this is ill-defined. Does it mean something more than music being too loud? Could this be further clarified? Could times of the day be specified, for example?

Section 6.0 “sound amplification”: students feel like this section is too strict; it’s hard to pull in students when the music is too quiet. UPD and even professors drop in sometimes to enforce the loudness issue.

Section 10.0 “bulletin boards”: posters must be no larger than 14” X 28”? That seems small, according to students. Could they be allowed to be larger? Also, parts of the policy seem outdated – e.g. the reference to “Clark Library.” In general, could there be more leeway regarding bulletin boards?

Various committee suggestions were made for how student organizations could gain more visibility. There was also general agreement that students could, with the help of the ISA chair, make suggestions for updating PD 01-01 and taking those amendments to the president for amendment to the Presidential directive or a Senate Univ policy.

### **Academic Integrity (S07-2)**

Concerns have been raised on a few specific points:

1. Not all faculty report violations of academic integrity; there is inconsistency across the campus on reporting practices. One cause here, possibly, is the slightly unclear nature of the policy, which allows for “discretion of the faculty.” That interpretation can be applied to so much of the rest of the policy. Some parts of the policy appear to conflict with other parts.

What can be done? Could the director of the Student Conduct & Ethical Development make a presentation to the senate?

Registrar Marian Sofish noted one omission from the policy: falsifying transcripts or diplomas. Could that be added? Also, illicitly using department letterhead to create false letters of recommendation.

2. Gleixner suggested that there currently seems to be no clear avenue for grade disputes. (This issue is actually separate from academic integrity.) Other committee members

noted that there indeed there is; a senate policy (number?) as well as a CSU executive order also delineate a process.

### **Advanced / priority registration**

Section 3.2 was edited on the senate floor to include the specific time of “5 years” in order to not be too vague. But now it seems too specific, and there needs to be “rolling” approval / re-approval.

# ISA minutes from 2/7/11 meeting:

---

**Present:** Stacy Gleixner (Chair), Bill Campsey, Stefan Frazier, Marian Sofish, Victor Culatta, Rich Kelley, Deanna Peck, Caroline Fee, Elizabeth McGee, Arlando Smith, Sheryl Walters, Stephen Branz, Kevin Starks, and Terri Thames (minute taker).

**Absent:** Mo Han, Tomasz Kolodziejak, Christina Solorzano,

Minutes from 1/31/11 meeting were reviewed, minor changes were noted, and minutes were approved.

**Extension of Prime Time Scheduling** period (attached) which amends F98-4

The committee discussed a request from Undergraduate Studies to quickly make a change to F98-4 to modify the prime time scheduling period for classes that meet for 150 minutes once a week. Currently those classes may be scheduled from 1:30 p.m. forward; UGS recommends that they be scheduled from 4 p.m. forward in order to maximize use of classrooms. After some discussion, the committee agreed to bring recommended changes to the next Senate meeting. The full F98-4 policy on class scheduling will be further revised in future meetings.

**Update on Time, Place, and Manner** <http://www.sjsu.edu/president/directives/current/pd0101.html>

The Senate executive committee and President Don Kassing has asked academic Senate to write a policy to replace the current presidential directive on Time Place and Manner (PD2001-01) for the campus. Stacy will work with Bill Nance of the president's office to draft and will consult with Cathy Busalacchi Student Union as well.

**Academic Integrity Amendment:** Attached is an amendment on falsifying the academic record to the current policy (S07-2) <http://www.sjsu.edu/senate/S07-2.htm>

The committee had a healthy discussion about the academic integrity policy and any needed changes to include misrepresentation of academic record. We discussed adding falsified information on petitions, letters of recommendation, whether to add failure to supply or disclose full transcript history. The committee decided to table this for now as it seems the student conduct code covers this.

**Academic Qualifications for Student Office Holders:** Amendment (attached) of S05-4 for <http://www.sjsu.edu/senate/S05-4.htm>

The committee discussed concerns that the current GPA requirement of 2.0 for major and minor student office holders is lower than some other student groups (e.g. the fraternity and sorority community as a whole) and is so low that students often find themselves on probation or are disqualified if their grades slip at all. Kevin reported that the Associated Students Board Of Directors are considering raising their current GPA requirements. The committee decided to ask the AS Board to recommend changes to the current policy (S05-4) and bring it to ISA and perhaps present the policy on the Senate floor. Kevin agreed to work with the board on this.

**Update on Amendment to Advanced/ Priority Registration.**

The committee is waiting on the student fairness committee to update us on this amendment.

**Graduate students: continued registration fees for RP units.**

The committee discussed financial impact of requiring graduate students to register while they are in the process of completing their research, scholarly activity, or other thesis related projects. As it stands they would pay upwards of \$2000 for each semester even if they were only enrolling in one unit. Enrolling through Open University would be a cheaper alternative but would not provide support for the academic department doing the advising. Marion Sofish (Registrar) will investigate to see if a one unit fee is possible and report back.

The following was tabled because of lack of time: **Starting Discussion of Student Lab fees:** The new Miscellaneous Course Fee Policy under EO 1054 prohibits departments from using lab fee money to purchase computers for instructional purposes (see page 14 in the EO-1054.pdf), The University approved the use of a

portion of the lab fees for technology-related purchases sometime in 2002 or 2003, but now we are told we can't use these funds to support the IT requirements of these courses.

The committee adjourned at 4 p.m.

# ISA minutes from 2/21/11 meeting:

---

**Present:** Stacy Gleixner (Chair), Bill Campsey, Stefan Frazier, Marian Sofish, Victor Culatta, Deanna Peck, Caroline Fee, Mo Han, Sheryl Walters, Victor Culatta, Stephen Branz, Kevin Starks, Terri Thames, Pam Stacks (guest), David Bruck (guest), and Christina Solorzano (minute taker).

**Absent:** Rich Kelley, Elizabeth McGee, Tomasz Kolodziejak, Arlando Smith

Minutes from 2/7/11 meeting were reviewed, minutes were approved.

## **Academic Senate Review**

All three of our committee policies were passed at the Senate; Academic Standing, SSR on Early Start, and an amendment to scheduling.

## **Time Certain 2:15; Graduate students: continued registration fees for RP units**

Faculty and library get no compensation for working with graduate students. David Bruck mentioned that he has been trying to get this through since he began working at SJSU. He wants graduate students to pay a registration fee for RP units for the use of research facilities and faculty time. They would be charged a supervisory course through special sessions, minimum \$250 for one unit. This would help keep record of the students in their RP master's course because they get lost in the system if the student were to drop out. This gives the opportunity to allow faculty to tell the graduate students to do certain things and help them graduate faster, rather than have the students get a project without much more instruction. Ms. Sofish mentioned that this helps bind the responsibility between students and thesis advisors. Mr. Starks said that something regarding faculty responsibility should be included in the policy to hold students and faculty accountable.

## **Grade Due Date**

Faculty would like to add a few more days to the grade due date. There is 85% submission according to the senate policy deadlines and 97% of grades are turned in before the very last due date. Mr. Campsey mentioned that it is helpful to have a cushion of a few days because when grading the tests, you have to rule out essay questions and stick to scantrons in order to get grades in on time. The other issue was having to turn in grades on a faculty non-duty day and will cause problems.

## **Student Lab Fees**

EO1054 gives different categories of which classes allow lab fees. This does not allow lab fee money to purchase computers. Mr. Starks gave the explanation and the example that the College of Business has rolling over money every year with money that is gathered from student lab fees to buy new computers every 2-4 years. More information will be provided in later discussions.

The committee adjourned at 4 p.m.

# ISA Minutes: 02/28/11

---

**In Attendance:** Steve Branz, Bill Campsey, Victor Culatta, Caroline Fee, Stefan Frazier, Stacy Gleixner (Chair), Mo Han, Richard Kelley, Elizabeth McGee, Deanna Peck, Arlando Smith, Christina Solorzano, Kevin Starks, Sheryl Walters

**Absent:** Tomasz Kolodziejak, Marian Sofish, Terris Thames

**Next meeting: Monday, 3/21, 2-4 p.m. in ENG 347**

## Approval of minutes from 02/21/11

- Minutes were unanimously approved

## Fee Policy for RP units

- The following concerns and ideas were discussed:
  - Currently, student can discontinue without any notice to the University, then the student will get a RP grade.
    - Suggestion 1: inform the student that need to pay fee for next semester unless the student do request a formal leave of absence
    - Suggestion 2: two consecutive semester of RP grades, then requires the student pays fee for RP units
  - Suggested that fee requirement for RP units to respect advisor's time and workload
    - Establish a general guideline for RP advisor's responsibilities
  - Discussed the RP units fee calculation idea
    - For example, 9 semester units of tuition  $\div$  3 = 3 RP units fee

## Process for Name Changes/Alternative Name Changes

- Point was raised that some students go by another name than their legal name
  - Currently, the University required students to submit "Change of Name" form at the Student Service Center with two required documents in order to change of name.
  - Discussed discrepancy concerning between the University class roster and preferred name by students



- PeopleSoft has an option to input for preferred name, but it's not an official change
- Can the University provide more supportive option for the population for their alternative names
- Discussion will be continued
  - Will estimate how many students are in this situation
  - Need to count how many the associated workloads will be required

### **Recalculating Academic Standing After Grade Changes**

- Concern was the University Grade Change deadline is too soon to file
  - Revealed that current deadline (to change grade) is a lot longer than the previous deadline to change grade

### **Time, Place, and Manner**

- The following ideas were discussed
    - Board and Bulletin boards (i.e., have locations be managed by the Associated Students)
    - Banners (i.e., have locations be managed by the Associated Students)
-

# ISA Minutes: 03/21/11

---

**In Attendance:** Steve Branz, Victor Culatta, Stefan Frazier, Mo Han, Richard Kelley, Elizabeth McGee (acting Chair), Deanna Peck, Arlando Smith, Christina Solorzano, Sheryl Walters, Tomasz Kolodziejak, Terri Thames, Paloma Mansour

**Absent:** Marian Sofish, Bill Campsey, Stacy Gleixner, Caroline Fee, Kevin Starks

**Guests:** Ken Peters, David Bruck

## Approval of minutes from 02/28/11

With correction to the misspelling of Terri Thames' name, minutes were approved with one abstention

## Announcements

Thomas Kolodziejak introduced a new member to ISA from Associated Students – Paloma Mansour. He also announced a new Associated Students scholarship program. This year there will be \$81,500 available for 7 scholarships.

## Frosh Housing

Ken Peters (guest) addressed two concerns with respect the first reading of the proposed Frosh Housing policy: 1) this policy came across quickly and deserves a full debate given the financial implications for students; 2) this policy will negatively impact low income students. The major difference between the draft of this policy and the current University policy is that the draft follows the CSU Long Beach Model. Peters feels the Long Beach policy is fairer to students because it is not geographically-based (all students would be required to reside on campus during their frosh year, but could petition for an exemption). In reference to a 30 mile radius, Culatta noted that the 30 mile radius guideline is based on high school location (not residence). Some members of ISA were concerned that this policy was initiated for financial reasons. Also discussed was whether this should be a policy at all.

## Fee Policy for RP units

David Bruck (guest) asked the committee if there were any questions or concerns regarding the first reading of the proposed fee policy for RP units. There was discussion of whether the last two “whereas” statements should be removed from the proposed policy. The first “whereas” states that most universities require continuous enrollment (with tuition) of graduate students. Some committee members noted that this was either vague or non-essential to the policy. The last whereas states that registration for RP units had strong support from the graduate coordinators at the annual open forum. One committee

member in attendance at that forum does not recall this being the case. A vote to amend this policy draft by removing these last two whereas statements did not pass (6 to 3). Other concerns included the second resolve statement, specifically reference to "The fee will not exceed 1/2 of the 1-6 unit in-state tuition." Some committee members felt this was vague and/or excessive and that this statement should be fine tuned. Some committee members felt that this policy was necessary in order to compensate faculty for their time but that the mechanism for such compensation was not clear.

The meeting was adjourned at 4 p.m.

# ISA Minutes: 04/4/11

---

**In Attendance:** Steve Branz, Bill Campsey, Victor Culatta, Caroline Fee, Stefan Frazier, Stacy Gleixner (chair), Richard Kelley, Paloma Mansour, Elizabeth McGee, Deanna Peck, Christina Solorzano, Sheryl Walters, Tomasz Kolodziejak, Terri Thames

**Absent:** Mo Han, Arlando Smith, Marian Sofish, Kevin Starks

**Guests:** Cathy Busalacchi

## Approval of minutes from 3/21/11

With correction to the misspelling of Terri Thames' name, minutes were approved with one abstention

## Frosh Housing Policy

- Discussed having the rationale up front as traditional whereas statements. This change was made in the policy.
- The housing director discussed how all housing directors are struggling with enrollment and how it impacts housing, a number of CSUs have mandatory housing policies
  - *Note added after meeting: The other CSUs with mandatory policies (according to research from Marian: Long Beach, Pomona, Monterey Bay, and \*\*\*\*)*
  - There have been 12 requests for exceptions out of 1900 frosh
  - Housing is working on adding more learning and living communities and enriching the quality/connection of housing to campus resources such as advising, counseling, etc. There is a pilot program now with LARC tutors coming to housing.
    - A whereas statement was added to express this.
  - Debt on housing is \$14Mil/year, this is going up to \$16/Mil year in 2013
- Deanna commented that there was a housing policy before at SJSU
- Discussed the financial concerns: that AB 540 students can't apply for financial aid. A clause "if eligible" was added to the policy to be more inclusive.

- The student committee members expressed that their main concerns were the financial impact on students and the mandating of adults on where they should live
  - Students distributed copy of AS 09/10 -07 “Resolution Against Any Type of Mandatory Housing Policy at SJSU” Text can be found here: [http://as.sjsu.edu/asgov/index.jsp?val=gov\\_docs](http://as.sjsu.edu/asgov/index.jsp?val=gov_docs)
  - Several other committee members also stated these as their primary concerns
- Discussed what constituted “approved” University housing.
  - “approved” was removed from wording in the policy
  - International house is included in University housing
  - The fraternities and sororities are not but their membership drives are in the spring so do not have frosh currently living in their houses
- Discussed clause of “space available” in housing
  - Fear was that if bricks filled first (which are a cheaper option) students would be forced to take the more expensive option
  - Vic emphasized that students are aware of the deadlines and understand that housing assignments are made on a first come, first serve basis. Also, the bricks have not been filling up in the recent past
- Discuss the different exemptions
  - The numbering in 1.B. was added to make it clearer which sections of the policy the exemptions were referring to
  - Discussed how section II are meant to be clear-cut, easily verifiable exemptions (married, military, age, etc)
    - Moved some of the more vague exemptions that require analysis into examples of exemptions by petition (sect 1.B.2.). These included: unique employment situations; care giver need or obligation; documented religious practices not compatible with University housing; documented medical, psychological or disability not compatible with University housing; financial need not covered in II.C.8; personal objection
  - Discussed the high school is within 30 miles limit

- Some committee members felt that San Francisco specifically and the Peninsula in general should all be included because of the ease of public transportation

- 

The meeting was adjourned at 4 p.m.

# ISA Minutes: 04/25/11

---

**In Attendance:**, Steve Branz, Bill Campsey, Victor Culatta, Caroline Fee, Stefan Frazier, Stacy Gleixner (chair) Mo Han, Richard Kelley, Paloma Mansour , Elizabeth McGee Deanna Peck, Arlando Smith, Marion Sofish, Christina Solorzano, Kevin Starks, Sheryl Walters, Terri Thames

**Absent:** Tomasz Kolodziejak

## Approval of minutes from 04/04/11

The specific four CSU campuses with mandatory Frosh housing policy will be provided by Marion Sofish and added to the 04/4/11 minutes.

## Frosh Housing Policy

Edits and revisions for clarity were discussed.

- Additional resolve was added: Resolved that the Housing Exemption Committee make a report to Instructional and Student Affairs in Spring 2012 on the exemption petitions to determine if the policy needs to be reevaluated.
- Discussion on Housing Requirement B2  
Exemption by Petition: personal "objection" was changed to personal "principle."
- Discussion on Academic Senate involvement in the Housing policy and signature of SJSU President. In the event that the housing policy is not approved by the end of Spring 2011, thus not available to be signed by President Kassing, incoming President Qayoumi will have the responsibility for the decision to sign this policy.

Vote taken to bring Frosh Housing Policy to the Academic Senate for a first reading.

Yes 11, No 3, Abstain 1

## Continuous Enrollment Requirement for Report in Progress (RP) Units

Edits and revisions were discussed:

- Whereas #2.....( revision) ”RSCA involves considerable University resources including faculty and staff time and library resources”
- Resolved #1.....( change) effective date from Spring 2012 to Fall 2012
- Resolved #2 ....(clarification of RP fee for 1 unit) Extended studies estimated cost is \$250-\$350 a semester.
- Resolved #3.... (Add) “Students who are in RP status will have a one semester grace period. (Add) Leave of absence option. (Add) Students will be notified of RP status via MySJSU.

Stacy will email revisions to ISA committee members.

Vote to take Policy to the Academic Senate for a first reading:

Yes 14, No 0, Abstain 0

### Wrapping Up of Unfinished Business

- **Time, Place, and Manner:**

UPD and Public Affairs are considering legal and campus implications.

- **Preferred Name:**

Registrar issues and legal implication are under discussion.

- **Computer Hardware and support costs through Lab Fees:**

These costs are not allowed as part of Lab fees. Other avenues will be explored. This issue will be moving out of ISA purview.

- **O&G Policy on ISA Membership changes:**

ISA Membership will be expanded to include a designee from Graduate Studies and Research and one from Student Academic Success Services.

Undergraduate Studies designee will now have voting rights.

The meeting was adjourned at 4 p.m.