

2013-2014 Year-End Committee Report Form

Committee: Organization and Government

Chair: Michael Kaufman

Chair-Elect for 2014-2015:

Michael Kaufman

4-5265

Zip 0106

Number of Meeting held:

12

(Please include phone/zip/email if available)

Items of Business Completed 2013/2014

1. S14-4: Omnibus naming policy for schools, colleges, facilities and properties
2. Decided to leave in place requirements for chairing a senate committee
3. SM-F13-1: Updating membership on the Instruction & Student Affairs committee
4. Worked out procedures with Student Fairness Committee to improve student participation

Unfinished Business Items from 2013/2014

1. Standards for review of administrators
2. Staff membership on the Senate
3. Staff membership on the Senate

New Business Items for 2014/2015

1. Reestablishment of Budget Advisory Committee responsibilities
2. Formalized charge and membership for AASSTF/CLSSTF
- 3.

Please return to the Office of the Academic Senate (ADM 176/0024) by July 18, 2014.

Organization & Government Committee
Minutes 8/26/13

Present: Michael Kaufman (Science, chair); Gita Mathur (Business); Pat Backer (Engineering); Noelle Brada-Williams (Humanities & the Arts); Preston Rudy (Social Sciences); Aaron Miller (Student Senator) ; Jason Laker (Education); Dorothy Poole (President's designee)

Absent: Chris Hebert (CASA); Damian Bacich (Humanities & the Arts)

1. Introductions

The members of the committee introduced themselves.

2. Minutes Takers

Pat Backer volunteered to take minutes.

3. Schedule

The O&G Committee will meet on the following days:

August 26, 2013, September 9, 2013, September 30, 2013; October 7, 2013; October 28, 2013; November 4, 2013; November 25, 2013; December 2, 2013; January 27, 2013; February 3, 2013; February 17, 2013; February 24, 2013; March 17, 2013; April 7, 2013; April 21, 2013; May 5, 2013

4. Committee Charge

Michael Kaufman discussed the charge of the committee.

5. Unfinished Business

- a. Assessment committee. The committee discussed the background of this referral. It was sent back to O&G from the Senate with suggestions.
- b. Qualifications for Chair of Senate Policy and Select Operating Committees. The 2012/2013 committee discussed this item last year but the referral is still pending.
- c. Additional member on I&SA (Associate Dean for GS&R). The committee discussed this referral. There needs to be a balance between faculty, administrators and students on the committee.
- d. Revisions to S05-5: title and membership of Heritage, Preservation and History Committee

6. New Referral

- a. Revisions to review procedures for Review of Administrators. The committee discussed this new referral. What institutions do this well?

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 pm.

Organization & Government Committee

Minutes 9 September 2013

Present: Michael Kaufman (Science, chair); Gita Mathur (Business); Pat Backer (Engineering); Preston Rudy (Social Sciences); Aaron Miller (Student Senator) ; Jason Laker (Education); Dorothy Poole (President's designee); Chris Hebert (CASA); Damian Bacich (Humanities & the Arts)
Absent: Noelle Brada-Williams (Humanities & the Arts)

Note-take—Preston Rudy

1. Minutes approved without amendment: 7 for, 2 abstentions

2. Assessment committee referral

The committee discussed the need for this committee and decided to table it rather than resubmit the resolution to the Senate.

Moved Backer, seconded Hebert, passed 9-0

3. ISA membership

This issue referred to the committee partially resulting from a request by the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies and Research who has been attending and would like to be considered a permanent member.

In examining the list of members, the committee discovered that the titles and positions needed to be updated as well.

Current I&SA Membership

Faculty: [8] One from each college and the General Unit

Student Affairs: [4]

Student affairs rep (Ombudsperson)

AVP Enrollment services

Dir. of Student Life or Designee

Dir. Of Residential Life or Designee

Academic Affairs: [1]

AVP Undergrad Studies, non--voting

Alumni: [1]

Associated Students: [2]

AS President

AS Dir. Of Student Resources

Students-at-Large: [3]

2 student senators

1 graduate student

Motion to amend the list as follows:

Student Affairs: [4]

University Ombudsperson

Director of University Housing Services

Director of Student Involvement

AVP of Administrative & Enrollment Services OR DESIGNEE

Academic Affairs: [2]

Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies, non-voting

Associate Dean of Graduate Studies, non-voting

Motion made by Laker, seconded by Backer, unanimous approval 9-0

4. Heritage and Historical Preservation referral

Tabled to next meeting. Chair will invite Danelle Moon to the committee to speak to us about this committee

Adjourned 15:25 (next meeting 30 September 2013)

Organization and Government Committee
Minutes of Meeting September 30, 2013

Present: Michael Kaufman (Science, Chair), Claudio Vera Sanchez (CASA), Gita Mathur (Business), Pat Backer (Engineering), Jennifer Morazes (General Unit), Damian Bacich (Humanities and the Arts), Preston Rudy (Social Sciences), Dorothy Poole (President's designee), Aaron Miller (Student Senator)

Absent: Jason Laker (Education), Chris Herbert (CASA), Noelle Brada-Williams (Humanities and the Arts)

Note taker: Gita Mathur

1. Approval of minutes
Approved with correction for Item 3: ISA membership
"Motion made by Laker, seconded by Backer, unanimously approved 8-0"
2. Time certain 2:15 - Danelle Moon to discuss referral on Heritage, Preservation and Public History committee (for description, see S05-5)
Danelle (Chair since committee formed in 2005) presented and Michael facilitated discussion:
 - Challenges of the committee: lack of participation, type of participation, lack of financial support, no champion, no significant action items or substance.
 - Questions about the future of the committee: Should it be dissolved? Should its focus be changed to Historic Preservation? Should the responsibility for facilities be given to Campus Planning Board and artifacts to Library? Can it be redefined to be smaller?
 - Suggestions: History needs to go back on website (no books on SJSU history). Committee needs to be publicized. Committee needs to be reorganized. Facilities person needs to be assigned (Robert Diaz is no longer a member).
3. Follow up discussion of rules for committee chairs - draft from Chris Hebert
Closure on By-Law Amendments: Michael explained the issue: Professional Standards Committee chair is required to be Tenured and Full Professor, what about the other three Policy Committee chairs?

Resolved: Proposed By-Law: 2.21.2: Nominees for Chair of Curriculum & Research and Organization & Government shall be tenured faculty.

Motion for it made by Backer, seconded by Miller, not-approved (Vote: 1 yes, 5 no, 2 abstain) (Note: Jennifer left before the vote).

Resolved: Proposed By-Law: 6.8.1: The Chairs of Graduate Studies & Research, Program Planning, and Undergraduate Studies committees shall be tenured faculty.

Motion for it made by Backer, seconded by Miller, not-approved (Vote: 2 yes, 6 no)
(Note: Jennifer left before the vote).

4. Referral - Staff membership on the Senate
Currently there is no Staff membership slot on the senate. Should there be?
Michael will find out more about what other CSUs do.
5. Review of rules for review of administrators (F10-5 and S06-3)
Michael presented Annette Nellen's referral.
Preston will look at what CSU Sacramento and East Bay are doing.
Dorothy will follow up with HR about 360 degree review models.
6. Clean up and clarification of "Policies and Procedures for Naming Colleges, Schools, and Other Academic Entities at SJSU" (S07-1 and S00-4 and S00-3)
Michael introduced this item for all to look at.
7. Adjourned: 3:50 pm

Organization and Government Committee

Minutes of Meeting October 28, 2013.

Present: Michael Kaufman (Science, chair); Pat Backer (Engineering); Damian Bacich (Humanities & the Arts); Noelle Brada-Williams (Humanities & the Arts); (Gita Mathur (Business); Aaron Miller (Student Senator) ; Preston Rudy; (Social Sciences); Jason Laker (Education); Dorothy Poole (President's designee); Claudio Vera Sanchez (CASA);

The chair announced he will try to have agendas out a week ahead from now on (was out of the country last week).

1. Minutes for the September 30th meeting were approved (9-0-1).

The chair gave an update on the passage of the most recent O & G resolution by the Senate.

2. Review of rules for review of administrators

Dorothy Poole reported on how evaluation is carried out right now, including the 360 degree review and who is involved in that. The chair mentioned that lists of outside constituents were usually developed with the evaluatee and the supervisor.

Preston Rudy reported on review procedures at CSUEB, Sac State and Long Beach. AAUP asserts that the majority of committee be faculty and a summary of the review produced and published for public access.

CSUEB: Detailed as to who the members should be; procedures are pretty open-ended.

Sac State: Faculty and administrators have staggered three-year appointments.

Long Beach: Reports produced for consultation between employee and manager. No public document (for all three). 5 faculty, appointees from president, staff member. Long Beach preferred face to face feedback as opposed to broad surveying.

DP noted that MPP does their own self survey based on the position description, and new job applicants are hired based on position descriptions but with review committees for MPP's, the position description are not always given. DB: II.3 mentions the job description. Is that not the written PD or is the policy too vague for it to be followed?

Questions on our deans' reviews have been somewhat generic. Does the incumbent get these questions? DP: The incumbent has goals given them on top of their original position description. Goals and outcomes need to be clearly stated/reported on. MK: Maybe we do not need a revision of the policy but a meeting with the people who start up the process. AM: Should we help people to interpret the policy? CVS: What would be useful?

DB: The process should be more objective and repeatable as a process. Faculty review is pretty clear. DP: Need to make assurances for sake of consistency and fairness. DP: Can we amend this to say “a PD and criteria provided by the supervisor?”

PR: The problem of shared governance implying some concensus of the governed.

MK: What if I go to the Provost and ask what has and hasn't worked? Ask your colleagues who have been on MPP review committees what has and hasn't worked. We should have Beth in as well.

Policies for naming Colleges, etc.

The policy was that there were a whole list of procedures that one went through to have a naming of anything larger than a classroom ok'ed, ending with the CSU board of trustees.

MK: One of the colleges received a donation and wanted to name the advising center after a former professor. Does that need to go through a naming committee?

MK: S07-1 restricts the people needed to approve the naming to the executive committee.

DP:

What constitutes preliminary campus approval?

S00-3: Defines what kinds of things are large enough to need board approval. Everything smaller needs to be approved by the President as chancellor/board designee.

MK: S07-1 as an attempt to keep things more confidential but that it is a consultative process.

We need to resolve the three policies ([S07-1](#) and [S00-4](#) and [S00-3](#)) into one clear policy.

Staff member on Senate

There are already staff members on the senate. Article 2, section 3B: general unit staff members 3 or 4. This doesn't mean that the place is reserved for student services professionals; general unit also includes counselling and library unit 3 faculty.

LB, Cal Poly, SD: no staff

Full 2 staff (but only full timers with a PhD).

EB 1 SF 3, MB 1 staff nonvoting: a hodgepodge...

Not clear how well known the opportunity for general unit to run for senate. It is not open for all staff.

JM: Petitions form is very clear. A clarification on the senate website might help. It may not address all staff concerns but

AM: AS looking into way of producing student response in a more collective way such as a Student Senate. We want the two bodies to work together so AS would like to get input

and approval of a working relationship from the Academic Senate. AS is looking for ways of

Next meeting is Monday, November 4, 2013 at 306 Science.
Adjourned at 3:17.

Organization and Government Committee

Agenda

December 2, 2013

2:00 PM, SCI 306

1. Approval of minutes
2. Clean up and clarification of “Policies and Procedures for Naming Colleges, Schools, and Other Academic Entities at SJSU” ([S07-1](#) and [S00-4](#) and [S00-3](#)). Draft of cleanup proposal can be found here.
3. Membership/student recruitment for the Student Fairness Committee ([S07-6](#))
4. Other
5. Adjourn

O&G Meeting February 24, 2014
Science 306
Minutes

Present: Kaufman (Chair); Bacich; Guerrazzi, Brada-Williams; Laker; Mathur; Rudy, Vera-Sanchez

Absent: Poole; Morazes; Backer, Miller

Scribe: Laker

1. Approval of minutes-8-0 (4 absent)

2. (Final) discussion of naming policies.

- BACKGROUND (Old policies are here: S07-1 and S00-4 and S00-3. Omnibus new policy is in Google Drive folder for this meeting. New policy refers to new CSU policies: 15501.00 and 15502.00
- Goal from previous meeting was to consolidate the Senate policies relating to naming of schools, colleges, buildings, spaces and “academic entities.”
- Dorothy Poole provided information on most recent Trustee policies relating to naming, which have been incorporated into the draft being discussed at this meeting.
- Chair Kaufman described the chain of approvals in old versus draft new policy, and the context for the present discussion. For example, naming of academic entities (e.g. schools, colleges, programs) went to the naming committee to the Senate Executive Committee, then to full Senate, then to President and finally to Trustees. Process was shortened for Sesquicentennial to expedite approvals associated with gifts (i.e. Naming and Senate Executive Committees send to President directly, who seeks approval from CSU Trustees.
- Committee members discussed and expressed appreciation for reasons for or against retaining expedited process.

Pro: shorter process with fewer people involved protects donor confidentiality and ability to ratify quickly.

Con: reduces possibilities of principled objections prior to naming decision.

- Present members agreed on two mitigations:

1. Mention such concerns in the background information
2. Include provision in new policy for Naming and/or Senate Executive Committees to refer naming proposals to full Senate in instances where decision likely requires more deliberation due to its complexity, sensitivity, possible controversy, or the like. The same would be the case for removal of names.
3. Follow-up on membership of Student Fairness Committee after first-reading feedback.
 - Committee deliberated whether to designate the expanded number of student seats as graduate, undergraduate or at-large.
 - Having only students of one designation or another is not desirable, but neither is having a shortage of student members due to excluding a student from the “wrong” designation (e.g. unable to fill undergrad seat when there is a graduate student volunteer).
 - Committee agreed unanimously to designate the seven student seats as five undergraduate and two graduate for first three weeks of semester, after which persistent vacancies become “at-large” to be filled by any appropriate student.
4. Other
 - Professional Standards Committee reviewing Chair appointment and removal policies and may refer some or all to O & G.
5. Adjourn

O&G Meeting March 17, 2014

Science 306

Minutes

Present: Kaufman (Chair), Bacich, Brada-Williams, Laker, Mathur, Miller, Morazes, Vera-Sanchez

Absent: Poole, Backer, Guerrazzi, Rudy

1. Approval of minutes-7-0 (5 absent at that time) after the minutes were amended to clarify that Dorothy Poole's contribution to our last meeting was done through email.

2. Discussion of the naming policy resolution in response to the senate's response to the first reading included a discussion of membership on the committees and whether or not they are appropriate not only to the naming of facilities but to other entities.

The committee agreed to add a "whereas" clause to show that our intent is to include stakeholders closest to the naming issues that may arise and thus to consult people from constituencies most relevant to the entity being named. Then we discussed how to define the role members will play in doing due diligence to vet the names before sending it on to the executive committee.

During the senate meeting, one person asked why the chief of staff would chair the committee if no donation was given. The committee suggested that "VP for advancement" or "president's designee" would be appropriate for donor and non-donor naming opportunities.

These changes passed unanimously (8-0 with 4 absent at this point).

3. The committee received a referral requesting us to consider the Assistant VP for Faculty Development (a new position that we are currently in the process of recruiting/hiring process) be given a place on Professional Standards (where the Associate VP for Faculty Affairs currently sits). Since the AVP for Faculty Development position does not *currently* exist at this university, the committee decided to table this referral for now.

4. A referral that was given to O & G last year (and just rediscovered) asked that the charge of the Undergraduate Studies Committee (which reports to C & R) be amended to include "encourages and supports curricular innovation on campus." Members of the O & G committee discussed that this could bring up a more fundamental question of the role of the structure of governance.

5. The final agenda item, voting procedures in policy for review of administrators (S06-3), will be considered at our next meeting: Monday April 7th at 2 PM.

6. Adjourned at 3:06.

O & G Meeting (04-07-14)
Science 306
Minutes

1. Look at minutes from last meeting. 6 approve and one abstains. Guerrazzi, Brada-Williams, Laker, Poole, Morazes are absent. Present: Michael Kaufman, Pat Backer, Gita Mathur, Preston Rudy, Damian Bacich, Aaron Miller, Claudio Vera Sanchez.
2. First business item is the Naming Policy. Two concerns from the senate: (1) curriculum and research should be added to the policy (thereby guaranteeing senate representation). Why would C & R be the representative some members asked? If senate representation is important, why C & R? and (2) the word “illegal discrimination” appears. Drop the word “illegal.”
3. The second item: Voting procedures (S06-3). Administrators section 3-b. The policy involves selecting chairs to review the Deans. Other policies have a tangible process to demonstrate how nomination for the department chairs will happen. The major concern is that the current policy does not clearly articulate whether the Dean can or cannot be involved in the process of electing the faculty for the review of the dean. In colleges that work well, this would not be an issue. Some committee members raised concerns, however, that there are colleges with many interim chairs (and thus chairs might not speak up if any procedural irregularities happened). Some members suggest that perhaps the Provost’s office can play a role in the election process.
4. What modifications should be added to the policy? Some members asked whether it is necessary to change the policy at all. There is a consensus that there is no need to change the policy, if it is not necessary. At this point, there are no impending Dean reviews, requiring a quick modification of the policy. Table this policy until we get more information.
5. One more item. Changing election procedures. Changing the associate vice chair term to two years. The justification is that the learning curve involves more than one year (currently the policy provides a one year term). In the middle of the term, faculty have to request a new term. It is also hard to train and then let those faculty go (it is also a workload issue for the trainers). Most chairs in practice, however, end up serving two years. One concern is that rewriting the policy to two years prevents from getting the person replaced if he or she is not a good fit.

O & G Meeting (04-07-14)
Science 306
Minutes

1. Look at minutes from last meeting. 6 approve and one abstains. Guerrazzi, Brada-Williams, Laker, Poole, Morazes are absent. Present: Michael Kaufman, Pat Backer, Gita Mathur, Preston Rudy, Damian Bacich, Aaron Miller, Claudio Vera Sanchez.
2. First business item is the Naming Policy. Two concerns from the senate: (1) curriculum and research should be added to the policy (thereby guaranteeing senate representation). Why would C & R be the representative some members asked? If senate representation is important, why C & R? and (2) the word “illegal discrimination” appears. Drop the word “illegal.”
3. The second item: Voting procedures (S06-3). Administrators section 3-b. The policy involves selecting chairs to review the Deans. Other policies have a tangible process to demonstrate how nomination for the department chairs will happen. The major concern is that the current policy does not clearly articulate whether the Dean can or cannot be involved in the process of electing the faculty for the review of the dean. In colleges that work well, this would not be an issue. Some committee members raised concerns, however, that there are colleges with many interim chairs (and thus chairs might not speak up if any procedural irregularities happened). Some members suggest that perhaps the Provost’s office can play a role in the election process.
4. What modifications should be added to the policy? Some members asked whether it is necessary to change the policy at all. There is a consensus that there is no need to change the policy, if it is not necessary. At this point, there are no impending Dean reviews, requiring a quick modification of the policy. Table this policy until we get more information.
5. One more item. Changing election procedures. Changing the associate vice chair term to two years. The justification is that the learning curve involves more than one year (currently the policy provides a one year term). In the middle of the term, faculty have to request a new term. It is also hard to train and then let those faculty go (it is also a workload issue for the trainers). Most chairs in practice, however, end up serving two years. One concern is that rewriting the policy to two years prevents from getting the person replaced if he or she is not a good fit.