2017-2018 Year-End Committee Report Form

Committee:
Professional Standards

Chair: Kenneth Peter	**Chair-Elect for 2018-2019**: Kenneth Peter
Number of Meeting held:	(Please include phone/zip/email if available) 45562 0119 kenneth.peter@sjsu.edu

Items of Business Completed 2017/2018

1. Continued revisions/negotiations on Chairs and Directors policy which was passed and signed.
   Issue memo with AVPFA detailing best practices for scheduling and conducting RTP meetings.
   Amended RTP to liberalize role of Department Chair on RTP committees.
   Amended and updated the Grant Related Instructional Faculty policy.
   Drafted a policy concerning Program Coordinators; withdrew as unworkable after campus feedback.
   Updated the Faculty Awards policy to provide a process for the Wang awards; an effort to expand to include staff was withdrawn after administrative opposition.
2. Amended the Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility Policy to create a stand-alone academic freedom committee. This remains unsigned.
   Investigated the problem of faculty who are "borrowed" across college lines; issue resolved by actions of the Provost.
   Rescinded an obsolete policy on SOLATEs.
   Began a review of the issue of faculty bullying.
3. Amended RTP to clarify the period of review for the "mini reviews."
   Reviewed numerous department RTP guidelines.

Unfinished Business Items from 2017/2018

1. Unclear as to status of Academic Freedom Committee.
   Sense of the Senate on faculty bullying.
   Dealing with the veto of the information privacy policy.
2.
3.

New Business Items for 2018/2019

1. Referrals PSF18-1 and PSF18-2 have arrived over the summer.
   Figuring out how to deal with the lack of an AVPFA.
2.
3.

Please return to the Office of the Academic Senate (ADM 176/0024) by May 31, 2018.

Professional Standards Committee
August 28th 2017 Meeting Minutes

Meeting 1: August 28, 2017 // Clark Hall 445 // 2:00-4:00 PM
Members present: Jessica Chin, Armani Donahue, Steven He, Michael Kimarow, Paul Kauppila, Michael Kimbarow, Roxana Marachi, Alison McKee, Kenneth Peter (Chair), Brandon White (with visit from Stefan Frazier, Chair of Senate).

To be joining in future meetings: James Lee and Judith Lesson-Hurley

Minutes taken by Roxana Marachi (2:00-3:40) and Paul Kauppila (3:40-4:00)

1. **Meeting was called to order at 2pm and new and continuing members were introduced and welcomed.** The following are new members.
    a. Michael Kimbarow, Interim AVP Faculty Affairs
    b. Jessica Chin, CASA (Kinesiology Department)
    c. Steven He, Business (Accounting and Finance Department)
    d. Alison McKee, H&A (Film & Theatre Department)
    e. Armani Donahue (Student - Psychology Major and Sociology Minor)

    Steph Frazier, new Chair of the Senate also joined and welcomed all

2. **Update on Department RTP Guidelines: Chair's Report**
    a. The following departments have approved guidelines that have been posted on the Faculty Affairs website: Department of Nutrition, Food Science and Packaging, School of Information, Department of Occupational Therapy, English Department, Library, Department of Anthropology

    b. The following academic unit is required to have guidelines, has had drafts reviewed twice, but does not yet have approval: Counseling

    c. The following departments had guidelines reviewed last year but have not yet submitted revised guidelines: Nursing, Comm Studies, Environmental Studies, Urban and Regional Planning. We gave feedback and none have since submitted revisions.

    d. The following departments had guidelines submitted more than one year ago and have not resubmitted: Engineering (college guidelines), Music and Dance, Journalism, Justice Studies. Also gave feedback and did not have resubmissions.

    e. The following department submitted guidelines for review too late for our Spring meetings and will be reviewed today: Department of Sociology and Interdisciplinarly Social Science SISS
    f. Total: 6 approved, 9 reviewed but not resubmitted, 1 to review

3. **Three major policies created by PS last year that are (still) in limbo: Chair's Report (with updates embedded and new discussion at end of section)**
    a. **Chairs and Directors Policy**. A major part of our work for last year. Prior to final reading at the Academic Senate we pulled this from the agenda when the Provost communicated concerns about some of the policy language. We agreed to hold this policy until he could come talk to us. He is scheduled to visit PS on our September 25th meeting, 3:30.

    b. **Information Privacy Policy.** S17-18 Privacy of Electronic Information (Replacement for 1997 policies) was another major part of our work from last year. This policy was passed by the Senate with no "no" votes in April and is yet to be signed by the President. Recent email update indicates that she would like further discussion against backdrop of CSU policy, the realities of investigation process, etc. Some concerns related to the use of the terms such as "rare" and "clearly defined" mandatory disclosure to individuals and the requirement of an annual report.

    c. **Consideration for Early Tenure for Previously Tenured Faculty** was passed by the Senate unanimously in March, after being negotiated with the Provost. This policy has not been signed.

    d. Jay Bailey shared by email additional details about reasons for not yet getting final signatures on several of the policies. Jaye had visited one of the Professional Standards meetings in Spring 2017 to help us negotiate compromises on the following policies. Updates include:

        i. S17-18 (Privacy of Electronic Information) Details are described in 3b. above.
        ii. S17-19 (Registration Priority) "The President would like to know how/why the categories were determined. It appears that "Priority" applies to too many."
        iii. S17-12 (University Learning Goals) "The President would like the Senate to get outside input."
        iv. S17-13 (UG Student Honors (Summa Cum Laude score) "The President would like discussion on the qualifying GPA for Summa."
        v. Amendment C to S15-16 (Appt. of Regular Faculty, Early Tenure "The President would like further discussion on this. She has questions regarding the CBA (requires President approval) and the justification for not using the stringent standard for someone who has already been successful at another institution."

    e. In addition and related to S17-18 (Privacy of Electronic Information), question was raised regarding privacy policies of external apps when students and/or faculty/staff would be required to use ones that had been contracted to partner with the University. National Education Policy Center recently published report

on privacy concerns related to many digital apps and software programs entering educational spaces. Given that policy had not yet been signed, questions for further consideration include:

1. Are any of the software/app contracts signed in a way that allows student and/or faculty/staff/admin data to be drawn without users' knowledge or consent?
2. What are the processes by which software or app contracts are determined? What opportunities are there for faculty review and/or public input?
3. To what extent are users informed about ways their data would be used. Do options exist to opt out? An example related to questions above was shared regarding "Dotin.us" app whose founder reached out directly to solicit faculty involvement. It appears from the solicitation email that Dotin.us (KonnectIn app) already has a formal partnership with the University. [Related attachments are also provided via pdf in Appendix to Minutes].

4. **Report on Faculty 180 transition: AVP Kimbarow.**
   eFaculty (Faculty 180) Electronic platform for submission of all RTP, Sabbatical Applications, Faculty Early Retirement Program, and Different in Pay Leaves. Transitioning Fully to electronic dossier submissions. A few revisions are pending and we will be moving ahead with full campus rollout. Trying to anticipate as many of the issues that arise and put in solutions in place. Deans across colleges have made resources available to have support in scanning. One appealing feature is that within the initial narrative statement, faculty would make a case and be able to link to the supporting evidence.

5. **Memo on RTP Committee Meetings: Should FA and PS issue?**

6. **Sociology and Interdisciplinary Social Sciences: Review of Department Guidelines (included)**
   [Summary notes by P. Kauppila] The committee reviewed the RTP (retention, tenure, and promotion) guidelines submitted by the Department of Sociology and Interdisciplinary Social Sciences. The committee suggested certain revisions and raised various issues. [see below] It was noted that the document would be strengthened by including specific examples of what might enable a candidate for retention, tenure, or promotion to reach the levels of achievement described in the campus RTP policy. The committee also commented on the vagueness of the Service section of the document.

   [Additional notes prior to R. Marachi departure]
   A. Need to record the vote of their department. It appears to be missing.
   B. Purpose of this document (not to specify), rather should be changed to "clarify"?
   C. Under Academic Assignment. – look at the first pp of description – how much belongs under Service (Sec. 2 of RTP policy). Some of the activities refer to service. Under new policy Academic Assignment is more teaching rather than curriculum building, for example.
   D. Actual Baseline, Good, Excellent did not add new information to policy descriptors in 3.31 and could be omitted. They don't have to have guidelines for all three. If they are going to have guidelines, they should be reflected more specifically. Either delete or give specifics

related to what they do. Under Scholarly and Creative activity – capacity to create dictated by "available resources" – if they will reference, then they need to add in a much more substantive way.

E. Need more clarity on the "Under social media" page related to writing in social media when reviewed by experts who are able to make an objective evaluation. Review part is clear enough but clarifying "such work" would be helpful (to provide descriptors or examples for what they mean).
F. Experts can be qualified academics or community representatives. More specific about the relationship between categories of scholarship would strengthen. Need to clarify what is meant by manuscript. The word 'forthcoming' may help to clarify that manuscript has been accepted for publication.
G. Under Service –Should describe it in more detail. Many of their interdisciplinary programs appear to heavily involved integration with community. Questions included if there is more oriented toward Sociology than the other areas? Much of this section is already present in University Policy 3.3.3. Not elucidating how they are unique. Would like to see service component more elaborately described.
H. The committee recommended that the guidelines be returned to the department and later re-submitted.

7. **Discussion: RTP Amendment -** The committee then addressed the question of whether a department chair serving on an RTP committee must also chair that committee. The new Senate policy says yes. The committee discussed whether chairs (particularly of larger departments) should be allowed to serve on RTP committees without having to serve as chair, and whether that decision would be up to the chair the committee. This is a workload issue that has come up more than once. If the policy is amended to allow chairs to serve on RTP committees without serving as chair of that committee, should this also cover recruitment committees?

8. **RTP Amendment: Voluntary vs. non-voluntary service on RTP committees** - What is the relation to the Senate policy? See memo from Michael Kimbarow. Can a committee member be removed for non-performance and would the entire committee then have to be re-elected?

9. **Setting the Agenda for PS AY 17-18 -** The Professional Standards committee members were then solicited for possible future agenda items. From earlier discussion A. Donahue had suggested exploring Teacher (Faculty) Training for Advising roles. Additional suggestions during agenda item included post-tenure review (F81-7, which is obsolete and should be updated), the appointment and review of program directors (currently unregulated by Senate policy), what to recommend to RTP committees on the question of "predatory" journals, and what action to take regarding the nearly defunct Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR.).

The meeting was then adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Roxana Marachi and Paul Kauppila

Professional Standards Committee
August 28th 2017 Meeting Minutes

Meeting 1: August 28, 2017 // Clark Hall 445 // 2:00-4:00 PM
Members present: Jessica Chin, Armani Donahue, Steven He, Michael Kimarow, Paul Kauppila, Michael Kimbarow, Roxana Marachi, Alison McKee, Kenneth Peter (Chair), Brandon White (with visit from Stefan Frazier, Chair of Senate).

To be joining in future meetings: James Lee and Judith Lesson-Hurley

Minutes taken by Roxana Marachi (2:00-3:40) and Paul Kauppila (3:40-4:00)

1. **Meeting was called to order at 2pm and new and continuing members were introduced and welcomed.** The following are new members.
    a. Michael Kimbarow, Interim AVP Faculty Affairs
    b. Jessica Chin, CASA (Kinesiology Department)
    c. Steven He, Business (Accounting and Finance Department)
    d. Alison McKee, H&A (Film & Theatre Department)
    e. Armani Donahue (Student - Psychology Major and Sociology Minor)

    Steph Frazier, new Chair of the Senate also joined and welcomed all

2. **Update on Department RTP Guidelines: Chair's Report**
    a. The following departments have approved guidelines that have been posted on the Faculty Affairs website: Department of Nutrition, Food Science and Packaging, School of Information, Department of Occupational Therapy, English Department, Library, Department of Anthropology

    b. The following academic unit is required to have guidelines, has had drafts reviewed twice, but does not yet have approval: Counseling

    c. The following departments had guidelines reviewed last year but have not yet submitted revised guidelines: Nursing, Comm Studies, Environmental Studies, Urban and Regional Planning. We gave feedback and none have since submitted revisions.

    d. The following departments had guidelines submitted more than one year ago and have not resubmitted: Engineering (college guidelines), Music and Dance, Journalism, Justice Studies. Also gave feedback and did not have resubmissions.

    e. The following department submitted guidelines for review too late for our Spring meetings and will be reviewed today: Department of Sociology and Interdisciplinarly Social Science SISS
    f. Total: 6 approved, 9 reviewed but not resubmitted, 1 to review

3. **Three major policies created by PS last year that are (still) in limbo: Chair's Report (with updates embedded and new discussion at end of section)**
    a. **Chairs and Directors Policy**. A major part of our work for last year. Prior to final reading at the Academic Senate we pulled this from the agenda when the Provost communicated concerns about some of the policy language. We agreed to hold this policy until he could come talk to us. He is scheduled to visit PS on our September 25th meeting, 3:30.

    b. **Information Privacy Policy.** S17-18 Privacy of Electronic Information (Replacement for 1997 policies) was another major part of our work from last year. This policy was passed by the Senate with no "no" votes in April and is yet to be signed by the President. Recent email update indicates that she would like further discussion against backdrop of CSU policy, the realities of investigation process, etc. Some concerns related to the use of the terms such as "rare" and "clearly defined" mandatory disclosure to individuals and the requirement of an annual report.

    c. **Consideration for Early Tenure for Previously Tenured Faculty** was passed by the Senate unanimously in March, after being negotiated with the Provost. This policy has not been signed.

    d. Jay Bailey shared by email additional details about reasons for not yet getting final signatures on several of the policies. Jaye had visited one of the Professional Standards meetings in Spring 2017 to help us negotiate on the information privacy policy.

        i. S17-18 (Privacy of Electronic Information) Details are described in 3b. above.
        ii. Amendment C to S15-16 (Appt. of Regular Faculty, Early Tenure "The President would like further discussion on this. She has questions regarding the CBA (requires President approval) and the justification for not using the stringent standard for someone who has already been successful at another institution."

    e. In addition and related to S17-18 (Privacy of Electronic Information), question was raised regarding privacy policies of external apps when students and/or faculty/staff would be required to use ones that had been contracted to partner with the University. National Education Policy Center recently published report on privacy concerns related to many digital apps and software programs entering educational spaces. Given that policy had not yet been signed, questions for further consideration include:
        1. Are any of the software/app contracts signed in a way that allows student and/or faculty/staff/admin data to be drawn without users' knowledge or consent?

2. What are the processes by which software or app contracts are determined? What opportunities are there for faculty review and/or public input?
3. To what extent are users informed about ways their data would be used. Do options exist to opt out? An example related to questions above was shared regarding "Dotin.us" app whose founder reached out directly to solicit faculty involvement. It appears from the solicitation email that Dotin.us (KonnectIn app) already has a formal partnership with the University. [Related attachments are also provided via pdf in Appendix to Minutes].

4. **Report on Faculty 180 transition: AVP Kimbarow.**
eFaculty (Faculty 180) Electronic platform for submission of all RTP, Sabbatical Applications, Faculty Early Retirement Program, and Different in Pay Leaves. Transitioning Fully to electronic dossier submissions. A few revisions are pending and we will be moving ahead with full campus rollout. Trying to anticipate as many of the issues that arise and put in solutions in place. Deans across colleges have made resources available to have support in scanning. One appealing feature is that within the initial narrative statement, faculty would make a case and be able to link to the supporting evidence.

5. **Memo on RTP Committee Meetings: Should FA and PS issue?**
It had already been issued by the time that we had met. AVP had issued the memo and it did not need discussion.

6. **Sociology and Interdisciplinary Social Sciences: Review of Department Guidelines (included)**
[Summary notes by P. Kauppila] The committee reviewed the RTP (retention, tenure, and promotion) guidelines submitted by the Department of Sociology and Interdisciplinary Social Sciences. The committee suggested certain revisions and raised various issues. [see below] It was noted that the document would be strengthened by including specific examples of what might enable a candidate for retention, tenure, or promotion to reach the levels of achievement described in the campus RTP policy. The committee also commented on the vagueness of the Service section of the document.

[Additional notes prior to R. Marachi departure]
A. Need to record the vote of their department. It appears to be missing.
B. Purpose of this document (not to specify), rather should be changed to "clarify"?
C. Under Academic Assignment. – look at the first pp of description – how much belongs under Service (Sec. 2 of RTP policy). Some of the activities refer to service. Under new policy Academic Assignment is more teaching rather than curriculum building, for example.
D. Actual Baseline, Good, Excellent did not add new information to policy descriptors in 3.31 and could be omitted. They don't have to have guidelines for all three. If they are going to have guidelines, they should be reflected more specifically. Either delete or give specifics related to what they do. Under Scholarly and Creative activity – capacity to create dictated by "available resources" – if they will reference, then they need to add in a much more substantive way.

E. Need more clarity on the "Under social media" page related to writing in social media when reviewed by experts who are able to make an objective evaluation. Review part is clear enough but clarifying "such work" would be helpful (to provide descriptors or examples for what they mean).
F. Experts can be qualified academics or community representatives. More specific about the relationship between categories of scholarship would strengthen. Need to clarify what is meant by manuscript. The word 'forthcoming' may help to clarify that manuscript has been accepted for publication.
G. Under Service –Should describe it in more detail. Many of their interdisciplinary programs appear to heavily involved integration with community. Questions included if there is more oriented toward Sociology than the other areas? Much of this section is already present in University Policy 3.3.3. Not elucidating how they are unique. Would like to see service component more elaborately described.
H. The committee recommended that the guidelines be returned to the department and later re-submitted.

7. **Discussion: RTP Amendment -** The committee then addressed the question of whether a department chair serving on an RTP committee must also chair that committee. The new Senate policy says yes. The committee discussed whether chairs (particularly of larger departments) should be allowed to serve on RTP committees without having to serve as chair, and whether that decision would be up to the chair the committee. This is a workload issue that has come up more than once. If the policy is amended to allow chairs to serve on RTP committees without serving as chair of that committee, should this also cover recruitment committees?

8. **RTP Amendment: Voluntary vs. non-voluntary service on RTP committees** - What is the relation to the Senate policy? See memo from Michael Kimbarow. Can a committee member be removed for non-performance and would the entire committee then have to be re-elected?

9. **Setting the Agenda for PS AY 17-18 -** The Professional Standards committee members were then solicited for possible future agenda items. From earlier discussion A. Donahue had suggested exploring Teacher (Faculty) Training for Advising roles. Additional suggestions during agenda item included post-tenure review (F81-7, which is obsolete and should be updated), the appointment and review of program directors (currently unregulated by Senate policy), what to recommend to RTP committees on the question of "predatory" journals, and what action to take regarding the nearly defunct Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR.).

The meeting was then adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Roxana Marachi and Paul Kauppila

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 2: September 11, 2017
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes taken by Seat H: White

Call to order: 2:07pm

1. Call to Order and introductions. Present: Ken Peter, Brandon White, Michael Kimbarow, Jessica Chin, James Lee (New member, Statewide Senator), Steven He, Roxana Marachi, Alison McKee, Sotoudeh Hamedi-Hagh, Paul Kauppilla, Armani Donahue.
2. Minutes from previous meeting (08/28/2017) approved with minor corrections as noted by Chair Peter.
3. Updates: Productive Discussion with President about Early Promotion and IT Policies. She will take under consideration.
4. Discussion of Counseling RTP Guidelines. The majority of PS is new this year so Chair Peter provided an overview and historical of the guidelines from Counseling based upon committee recommendations previous year. The guidelines were updated based upon recommendations from AVP Green in December 2016 but never sent back to Faculty Affairs. Comments arose:
    a. Under "Counseling Effectiveness" concerns for Good and Excellent categories. The first sentences each appear very ambiguous and could be confusing to college and university committees. Perhaps making minor adjustments with clarification could resolve the issue. Motion that AVP Kimbarow accept guidelines but will discuss with counseling to make small modifications but the guidelines do not need to come back to PS. Motion passed unanimously.
5. Setting the agenda for PS for AY 2017-18
    a. Member suggested items?
        i. Review policy as well as CFA contract on voting and staffing committees, in particular RTP and search, with the goal to simplify procedures. James Lee looked quickly and appears that a vote must take place.

ii. Should faculty who teach online classes have online training? What would be important, how enforced, etc? Is this PS or ISA issue?
iii. Sabbatical Leave Policy (F08-4), what happens when a chair applies for a sabbatical? Policy is currently silent on this.
iv. Chair Review Policy….if majority of department is probationary (untenured) how would they start an early chair review especially in situations where retaliation might occur during an RTP process.
v. Office hours policy review?

b. Post Tenure Review?
c. Appointment of Grant Related Instructional Faculty? (F81-7). Coded memorandum from chancellor's office from 2004 that we follow. PS should bring to senate to rescind F81-7.
d. Program Director appointment and review?
e. Fraudulent Journals
f. Advisor Training (ISA referral maybe?)
g. BAFPR (Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility)

Committee voted and ranked in order of importance the following (each committee member could vote for up to 3):

Program Director (5)
RTP/Search Committee elections (5)
Fraudulent Journals (4)
BAFPR (4)
Post tenure review (0)
GRIF (3)
Advising Policy/Office Hours (3)
Sabbaticals for Chairs (3)

6. Amendment: Liberalizing role of Department Chairs on RTP Committees. Discussions occurred and made one adjustment, changed "the Chair shall write a separate recommendation." to "the Chair may write a separate recommendation." This comes into alignment with the CFA Contract. Will continue discussions on this amendment at next meeting. Concerns over whether department chair has the ability to appointment themselves as chair of the committee or not. This will not go to senate for first reading until a later date.
7. Adjourn at 4:03pm .

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes

Meeting 3: September 25, 2017
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes taken by Seat E: Hamedi-Hagh

1. Call to Order and introductions at 2pm.

   Presents: Ken Peter, Sotoudeh Hamedi-Hagh, Brandon White, Jessica Chin, Steven He, Roxana Marachi, Alison McKee, Paul Kauppilla, Armani Donahue

   Absents: Michael Kimbarow

2. Approval of minutes of Sept 11

   Approved (9-0-0)

3. Amendment: Liberalizing role of Department Chairs on RTP Committees:

   New revised policy S15-7 section 3.2.10:

   A Department Chair is eligible to serve on the department committee, and if elected to the committee the Chair of the Department shall not write a separate Chair's recommendation. If the Chair of the Department serves on the committee, then the Chair shall have the option to Chair the committee. Otherwise, the Committee shall elect its own Chair. If the Chair is not elected to the department committee or if the Chair declines to serve on the committee then the Chair may write a separate recommendation. The Chair of the Department may participate in either capacity only if he/she is of sufficient academic rank as per 3.2.5. Such recommendations shall be forwarded to the college level along with the recommendations of the department committee and any responses to the departmental level recommendation(s) supplied by the faculty member.

Discussions:

It might be fairer for RTP candidates if the committee can choose their own chair even if department chair elects to serve in the RTP committee rather than write their own evaluation.

Vote:

Rejected (1-8-0)

Original modified policy S15-7 section 3.2.10:

Department Chair participation. A Department Chair is eligible to serve on the department committee, and if elected to the committee the Chair of the Department shall not write a separate Chair's recommendation. If the Chair is not elected to the department committee or if the Chair declines to serve on the committee then the Chair shall write a separate recommendation. The Chair of the Department may participate in either capacity only if he/she is of sufficient academic rank as per 3.2.5. Such recommendations shall be forwarded to the college level along with the recommendations of the department committee and any responses to the departmental level recommendation(s) supplied by the faculty member.

Discussions:

The original policy seems to be more reasonable as it gives the RTP committee the right to elect their own committee chair.

Approved (8-0-1)

4. Revisiting the Chairs and Directors policy (attached); time certain to discuss with Provost Feinstein (3:30)

   Policy S14-8 section 5.2:

   Except in rare instances and for compelling reasons, the President shall appoint a person recommended by the department faculty.

   Discussions:

There was a case of conflict-of-interest between a chair and a dean that required rejecting the chair appointment. Otherwise, this could create governance issues by either supporting the dean and rejecting the chair or supporting the chair and searching for a new dean. So president has objection on the rare phrase in the language of this section.

Actions:

This policy section will be revised based on the feedback from provost.

Policy S14-8 section 6.4:

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

Discussions:

The section might consider the extension of interim chair beyond 6 months at the request of department faculty due to departmental organization change or a failed search. President cannot technically report or ask O&G.

Actions:

This policy section will be revised based on the feedback from provost.

5. Draft policy on Program Directors

   Discussions:

   Some program directors are elected by chair or appointed by dean's office for a very long period without any evaluation or feedback from faculty. They receive assigned time and/or compensation. The new mini policy will try to address all possible existing program directors across SJSU and create transparency.

6. Adjourn at 4pm.

Professional Standards Committee
October 2, 2017 Meeting Minutes

Attendance: all in attendance

1 Quorum was called by Chair Peters
2. Minutes- Corrections/edits Minutes are approved as written
3. Reports

Interim AVP Kimbarow reported on the eFaculty RTP dossier rollout. The initial submission deadline passed with minimal technical difficulties.
There was a discussion regarding the index generated by eFaculty and whether it was in compliance with CBA requirements. AVP Kimbarow reported that the CBA does not specify the form or the documents that must be listed in the index and that it was discussed and determined that the eFaculty index is in compliance with CBA requirement. Chair Peter reminded everyone that the original intent of the index was to make that faculty could not modify the dossier after the dossiers close. AVP Kimbarow reported that eFaculty prevents alterations to the dossier once it is "locked"

4. Discussion of Child and Adolescent Development's Draft Department RTP Guidelines.

A. Overview of the department is very useful; however, the specificity seemed excessive
B. Criteria for teaching, scholarship and service
    a. Preface- context of teaching evaluation not all that different from what is in the current RTP policy. It might be better to simply reference the RTP policy unless there is CHAD specific context
    b. Profiles- Guidelines Hypothetical what does someone at good, baseline
        i. Teaching component looks a little different in the Baseline- What's unique is that faculty teach in multiple areas.
    c. Matrices for service and scholarship are direct quotes and should be so noted
        i. Standards for "baseline" show too much variance from existing policy
        ii. Purpose of guidelines is to demonstrate how the guidelines will be implemented in the department.
        iii. Baseline matrix should provide examples.
        iv. Rethink the matrices-Quote policy and give examples- it should not be prescriptive but should show how the policy is applied
        v. It almost seems that they don't need guidelines.
    d. No information on publication venues- Quality is critical
    e. Breadth of teaching is unique to CHAD
    f. Providing examples of hypothetical profiles would be very helpful.
C. What is the problem they are trying to solve.

D. Are they are trying to modify baseline (to make it harder) and good (to make it easier? This would be a policy revision and cannot be approved as such.

Chair Peter and AVP Green presented to the dept. last year on how to develop department guidelines. There was no action for a year.

Motion- Recommend the AVP return guidelines to the department with recommendation for revision per discussion along with Chair Peter's written comments. **Adopted unanimously**

4. Agenda item #4. Amendment to S15-6, approved last week (8-1) will come to senate for first reading on October 25th.

5. Reviewed the policy recommendation re: selection of chairs and will forward as written to Andy for further review and feedback.

6. Program Directors. Referenced the discovery that Brandon shared with everyone re: program director.
A. In one college all graduate programs have a coordinator.
B. Certificate programs also have program director-
C. Departments do not appoint their own program director.
D. MBA director: First step is to appoint an interim director. Then there is a formal process. How does the Dean solicit "nominations"?
E. Evaluation of PDs: There is no formal policy driven periodic evaluation procedures. Some directors have been known to remain for 10+ years without review.
F. Chair's may serve as a PD in order to keep the release time for themselves.

G. There's no universal definition of the distinction between program directors and coordinators. It is inconsistently applied across campus.

H. In one college, some departments have program coordinators to oversee student teaching/clinical Internship program. There is no formal procedure for how the program coordinators are selected.

I. Question: Does the appointment letter for a PD/PC have a termination date?

H. Direction: 1. Drop the issue?
2. Approach it as a multi year effort- similar to chairs and directors policy?
3. Create a simple policy in the interest of openness and transparency re: the appointment of PDs and leave it up to the departments/deans for how it's done. Currently positions are allocated in a non-transparent manner, often through appointment without faculty consultation. Identify the

4. Identify components of an evaluation policy for PD re: length of time in position before an evaluation is required. What are the consequences of a poor evaluation?
5. Questions remain regarding the role of MPPs and lecturers without entitlement running programs.

7, Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR) Update.
A. They do have regular business,; however, thy no longer serves as the appellate court for grade disputes.
B. The BAFPR generally deals with 1 case a year on academic freedom. The BAFPR advises faculty affairs
Action: Academic Senate Chair Frazier will convene a meeting with past chairs of the BAFPR to discuss the future of the board.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55.

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes

Meeting 5: October 16, 2017
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes taken by Seat B: Chin

Members (Seats A-K): M. Kimbarow, J. Chin, S. He, R. Marachi, S. Hamedi-Hagh, P. Kauppila, A. McKee, B. White, K. Peter (chair), A. Donahue

Guest: S. Frazier

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call: all members present
3. Approval of minutes of Oct 2 (Kimbarow)
    a. approved with minor changes: i. remove names of departments from examples; ii. add roll call
4. Discussion: Selection and Review of Chairs and Directors policy
    a. S. Frazier will speak with president tomorrow, 10/17/17
    b. K. Peter explained point of policy clarifications was to help administer policy; he presented accommodations and concessions made to date by PC in response to feedback and concerns of President and Provost
    c. Options moving forward:
        i. move current version of policy as-is to Senate
        ii. wait for conversation between S. Fraser and President
        iii. stop pursuing
    d. Motion: send amended Chairs and Directors policy forward for final reading to academic senate at an appropriate future meeting
        i. passed, 9-0-1
5. Program Directors policy
    a. K. Peter circulated draft policy in advance of today's meeting
    b. Discussion on proposed title (does it capture the positions the policy is meant to cover?): "Transparency and Accountability for Faculty Positions with Significant Academic Oversight Responsibilities"

c. Objective of policy: to increase transparency and accountability, through i. open competition (transparency) and ii. review processes (accountability)
d. Discussion on 2.3; who should be included and not included
    i. White suggests removing 2.3 for now and focus on 2.1 and 2.2
e. Which positions should be openly publicized and reviewed/evaluated (i.e., normal service obligation vs. positions receiving assigned time); where do you draw the line?
    i. compensation with service time?
    ii. a distinction was made between responsibility for overseeing programmatic elements (course assignment, scheduling, determining faculty work assignment) vs. process for program (assessment); Kimbarow suggests including the former, not the latter, in this policy
    iii. Peter will check UCCD policy and get non-chair and non-director language (for people with chair and director-like duties)
    iv. The discussion ended with two options moving forward: 1. work on the policy as an umbrella policy, or 2. focus on function rather than compensation (see 5.e.ii above)
        1. for "function" option, challenge is delineating written policy and practice
        2. not feasible to request deans to apply policy for all .2 assignments (Kimbarow)
    v. Will need to consider how to approach positions that go across colleges or programs (He)
f. Chair Peter asks all members to work on 2.1 language

6. Discussion: Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR).
    a. Meeting to discuss with prior chairs of BAFPR on Tuesday 10/17, 3:00 pm, Clark 412
    b. Peter circulated latest policy draft with amendments, explained history of board to address ethical concerns and take on dispute resolution and history of amendments traveling through Senate (made it to first reading, but was pulled for further investigation)
    c. Members are required to be elected, full-professors
    d. Issues: i. pool of full profs is limited (lack of active membership, currently 4 open seats); ii. no intrinsic authority (only advisory), attached to Faculty Affairs

    e. Kimbarow suggests sending out survey to faculty to get a sense of their knowledge of BAFPR and issues that might be addressed by BAFPR
    f. (Re-)consider splitting into two groups
7. Updates on RTP dossier preparation (Kimbarow)
    a. minor technical issues; most a function of individual input errors or late submissions
    b. work around created for dept where chair has decided to serve on dept committee and not submit an evaluation: dept chair will submit "N/A" for chair evaluation
    c. at college level review, Kimbarow will reach out to receive feedback to refine for next year
    d. regarding volume and sheer number of submissions, relatively few issues
    e. some folks who were supposed to be in line of review were not included; once identified, these people have been manually added to the system
    f. question: how do candidates insert missing required materials from dossier after closing date (Peter) per 5.4.2 S15-7 "missing materials"?
        i. to pre-empt such issues, faculty were given an option to share dossier with anyone for review prior to close
    g. Kimbarow stated that they could in the future extend deadline from 5pm to 11:59pm
    h. How is "significant and important" defined in criteria for good and excellent in RSCA and how will they be evaluated? (White)
        i. response: Depts need to develop guidelines for reviewers (Peter)
8. Update on early tenure policy amendments
    a. Need to have it approved by Dec or Jan to have an impact on upcoming search processes
    b. Previously passed unanimously by Senate
    c. However, no movement on compromise/compromise language to date with President
9. Update on information policy
    a. No update
10. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes

Meeting 6: October 30, 2017
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes taken by Seat C: He

1. Call to Order and introductions at 2pm.

   Presents: Ken Peter, Michael Kimbarow, Steven He, Roxana Marachi, Brandon White, Armani Donahue,

   Absents: Jessica Chin, Sotoudeh Hamedi-Hagh, Paul Kauppilla, Alison McKee,

2. Approval of minutes of Oct. 16.

3. Update: 1st Reading Chair participation amendment

   - The Chairs Participation amendment AS 1666 has no substantive issues at the first reading. It was sent to UCCD and we have not received any feedback yet.

4. Finalize: Chairs and Directors rationale

   - The rationale is developed to address the President's concerns and was very important in that it gives ammunition to persuade the President.
   - We may need to revise or delete some rationale because the audient of the rationale has changed.
   - We have already responded to the Deans' suggestions and it is not necessary to ask for feedback from the Deans again.
   - We will vote on this rationale during our next meeting.

5. Discussion: Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility.

- The four current members of BAFPR met with Stef, Ken, Judith, Paul, and past Chair Jason two weeks ago and had productive discussion.
    - Reforming the membership
        - It has been virtually impossible to attain the full staff board
        - Judith suggested allowing emeritus faculty to serve on the board.
        - Expending the pool of the people we can draw upon is appealing and having university wide membership may be appropriate.
    - Reforming the functions
        - Four major functions could be split apart.
        - The educative function of BAFPR is really needed more than ever.
        - Other three functions include student grade appeals, faculty on faculty complains, faculty on administration complains.
        - Maybe changing the membership will be enough to improve the functions of the board in general.
- Should consider to split into two groups. The educative function of BAFPR should be given to the new committee, Academic Freedom Committee. Members don't have to be full professors. They should be someone who knows about academic freedom and hold forum, speak at new faculty orientation, and other events. That group will become really important the next time there are some kind of dispute over what right-wing or left-wing extremists want to come to speak on campus.
- For another side, the professional responsibility, we need a core group with a volunteer pool, which could include full professors, representatives of administration, and emeritus faculty. The permanent chair of the board together with an administrator, senate chair and/or someone else could serve as the core group to appoint the panel for each case.

6. Transparency and Accountability reforms

- Functional definitions were added and the compensation function was subtracted.
- Need advice from the Deans on who should be covered.

- Will delete most of section 2 and send to the Deans for suggestions.
- Will ask the Provost to distribute to the Deans.
- Should the policy cover the MPP program directors as well?

7. Updates on RTP implementation

- Today is the department RTP committee submission deadline.
- There are still some minor issues regarding the access to the faculty files to complete the evaluations.
- There are some department chairs serving on the department RTP committees. They can select the not applicable option on the chair recommendations or upload a document saying that they are serving on the department RTP.
- We need the committee identified earlier than mid-September so that we can set up on time.
- We reviewed the RTP guidelines for the Department of Urban and Regional Planning and passed with minor revisions in March 2017. They did recommendations and resubmitted them in late May. The committee does not have to see the revisions again because it is so minor. Michael will contact the department and approve it.
- Each RTP committee is supposed to sign off on the agreement before they meet. Part of the agreement is confidentiality agreement. They should agree to delete any copies or downloaded documents when they finish the review.
- Some candidates seemed to focus so much on their electronic staff that they did not collect the documentation that were normally collected. Maybe it will change over time. These people need to be consulted.

8. Adjourn at 3:40pm.

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes

Meeting 7: November 6, 2017
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes taken by Seat G: McKee

1. Call to Order at 2:03 p.m.

    a. Present: Ken Peter, Sotoudeh Hamedi-Hagh, Brandon White, Steven He, Roxana Marachi, Alison McKee, Paul Kauppilla, Armani Donahue, Michael Kimbarow, Jessica Chin

    b. Absent: None

2. Approval of minutes of Oct 30 (He)

3. Update: Transparency and Accountability reforms (Coordinator Policy) out to Deans

    a. It has been forwarded for review to Provost Andy Feinstein as well as to the Deans who will meet this Thursday. It will need their input and support in order to progress, particularly in determining the relevant people to whom the policy will apply and how it will be implemented. One approach is to focus on 1) functional, and 2) compensatory definitions (while acknowledging that some people may be left out of consideration if this method is followed).

4. Update: Early tenure amendment will not be signed.

    a. President Papazian has not changed her opposition to this amendment.

    b. The Professional Standards committee endeavored to work out a policy for the possibility of offering early tenure for faculty who had already achieved tenure at a previous institution and were offered positions at SJSU.

    c. One possibility was to move the matter from RTP to Appointments so that decisions could be made on a case-by-case basis by the Provost, but the President overruled this.

    d. The President is concerned that consistency will be violated and that different faculty will be judged by different sets of standards. Current policy allows for two years' credit toward tenure but no more; faculty can still choose to go up early for tenure.

e. Motion: That the Political Standards Committee drop further work on this matter. Motion seconded.

Vote: Approved (8-1-1).

5. Update: Information privacy policy (originally forwarded in Spring 2017) will not be signed.

   a. President Papazian feels it will restrict the University's ability to access valuable information that may be needed for the purposes of law enforcement and legal investigation.

   b. Hank Reichman, chair of the AAUP's Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, might have useful input for this committee.

   c. Discussion:

      i. UC policy offers much stronger protections than SJSU. UC and AAUP insist that if one's email is monitored, one must be notified of the monitoring once an investigation is concluded, which is not the case at SJSU.
      ii. Issue: protection of academic freedom as well as protection of privacy for both faculty and students.
      iii. Related issue: potential for the mini and selling of faculty and student data
      iv. It's critical to insist that privacy and academic freedom are essential to the mission of the university, which must not be confused with the missions, standards, and definitions of corporations.

   d. Options:

      i. To draft a white paper that explains the extent to which faculty can and cannot expect in terms of protections and right to privacy at SJSU.
      ii. To hold hearings/informational sessions on issues of information privacy.

   e. Actions:

      i. Ken Peter will discuss the topic further with Jaye Bailey, Vice President for Organizational Development and Chief of Staff, and Hank Reichman, and report back to the PS Committee.

6. Finalize: Chairs and Directors rationale

   a. Discussion:
      i. President Papazian has indicated she is now comfortable with the following language of the "Policy Recommendation: Selection and

Review of Department Chairs and Directors" which she had disputed previously:

> When a department follows the procedures of this policy to successfully elect a Chair Nominee, the President shall -- except in rare instances and for compelling reasons—appoint that individual to serve as Department Chair (5.5.2)

b. Motion: That the "Policy Recommendation: Selection and Review of Department Chairs and Directors" and its accompanying rationale, considered here, go forward to the full Academic Senate on November 20, 2017 for a final reading. (Motion seconded.)

c. Vote: Approved (10-0-0).

7. Creation of Academic Freedom Committee

   a. There was general agreement that a separate AFC is a good idea and that Professional Standards (rather than O&G) will do the initial work (PS created the board in the first place).
   b. It will require faculty members who are experts on the issues, perhaps in partnership with CFA and/or AAUP.
   c. Once again, Hank Reichman's input would be valuable here.

8. Reform of BAFPR

   a. More work needs to be done and feedback gotten in this early phase of considering restructuring. At a minimum, we'd need experienced chairs for three different panels. Further discussion will follow.

9. Borrowed Faculty Referral

   a. Despite SJSU's statement that it values interdisciplinarity, the ease of sharing faculty members across colleges (and sometimes even departments) varies widely, as do the procedures for doing so.

   b. WASC targeted the "silo" culture at SJSU, which raises the issue to the level of institution-wide concern.

   c. Each time a faculty member is shared from one college to another, it seems to require the negotiation of an MOU and in some cases the Deans cannot agree on whether to share FTES, split salary, do vacant rate compensation, etc. The difficulties of working out these agreements sharply inhibit cross college interdisciplinary courses.

   d. Discussion:

i. Debate about the proper venue/area of focus for this referral.
ii. Financial issues are MPP issues.
iii. However, curricular issues are clearly at stake as well.
iv. In practice, it's necessary to walk the walk of interdisciplinary study and to make this happen.

1. Department chairs are responsible for the work assignments of their faculty.
2. Best practices: when opportunities arise across colleges to lend faculty, the chair and the dean of the lending side should enter into MOU agreement with the borrowing side.

e. Action: Ken Peter will invite Provost Andy Feinstein to talk to the PS Committee about how to encourage cross-college and cross-department cooperation and collaboration at SJSU.

10. Meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Meeting 8: Nov 13, 2017

Clark 445

2:00 PM - 4:00 PM

Minutes taken by Seat K: Donahue

1. Call to order: 3:03PM
    a. Present: Ken Peter, Sotoudeh Hamedi-Hagh, Brandon White, Steven He, Roxana Marachi, Alison McKee, Paul Kauppilla, Armani Donahue, Michael Kimbarow, Jessica Chin
    b. Absent: None
2. Minutes: Approved November 6, 2017 (McKee)
3. Update: Transparency and Accountability reforms
    a. Issue delayed until after Deans speak in December, feedback will be given then
4. Update: Borrowed Faculty Referral
    a. Will be taken up with Provost Feinstein will be at our next meeting.
5. Update: Information privacy policy
    a. Cancellation from Chief of Staff, conversation will be put on hold. Peter will have a meeting with her in January. Policy or not, faculty should know what they need to expect in terms of privacy with their information.
6. New referral: Staff awards
    a. The are many questions: when will staff be awarded? Who/what committee will be on the hunt to know what staff are considered? Should be a predominantly staff and a student (senator).

b. OR There should be some form of counsel mainly for staff and possibly linked to Academic Senate for transparency and ease for communication reasons.
c. Speaking to some Staff Union members, Beth Peliguise (to promote within), CFA staff.
d. Informal conversations first, then maybe make it more formal in the future.

7. Discussion: Qualifications for URTP members (S15-7)
    a. College RTP first, why? (section 3.4.2)
        i. Michael Kimbarow didn't want to mess with the policies, but gain understanding why the policy stated such. There still needs to be a checks-and-balances put into place make sure there are fair nominations.
        ii. There should be a person that is approved by faculty numerous times, but they should be adept with language that faculty are speaking about/with.
8. Discussion: O&G feedback on BAFPR reforms: one committee?
    a. Academic Freedom can be the operating committee based from each college versus many different pooled individuals being requested to commit.
        i. Pro Stands.: could be the one's filling the seats and panels through pool (5 full professors (can be emeriti) + a student) and they can report to this committee.
            1. Emeriti: members eligible by showing involvement in academia post professorship
    b. There should be an annual reporting and presentation to Senate to showcase how they have been promoting academic freedom.
9. New business

a. None

10. Adjourn: 3:52 PM

Professional Standards Committee Meeting Minutes

Meeting 8: November 27, 2017
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes Taken by Michael Kimbarow

1. Call to Order

Present: Jessica Chin, Armani Donahue, Steven He, Paul Kaupilla, Michael Kimbarow, Roxana Marachi, Alison McKee, Ken Peter
Absent: Sotoudeh Hamadi-Hagh, Brandon White

2. Amendments: Chairs and Directors Policy: Chair Peter presented a proposed amendment to the Chairs and Directors policy recommendation. Specifically inserting item 3.8 which incorporates and clarifies voting rights as it pertains to the nomination of a department chair. The committee addressed two major questions regarding the voting rights status of FERP faculty and faculty in the Pre-Retirement Reduction in Time Base (PRRTB) program. The consensus was that FERP faculty and faculty in PRRTB retain full department voting rights.

   The committee also discussed how to treat voting rights for faculty who may hold joint appointments in two or more departments. Interim AVPFA Kimbarow was asked to find out how many T/TT faculty hold joint permanent appointments in more than one department and report back to committee.

   The policy is now in possession of the Senate. The committee recommended to Chair Peter that the amended policy be brought back to the Senate as a substitute motion from Professional Standards.

   3.8.3 Ken will clarify if reference to CBA 17 pertains to all faculty and will report back to committee.

3. No updates on Transparency and Accountability Reforms.
4. Chair Peters' meeting with Chief of Staff Jaye Bailey to discuss information privacy was cancelled.
5. Chair Peter reported on preliminary positive feedback from the Provost, the Sr. AVP for Human Resources re: the creation of a staff recognition award.
6. Discussion of the BAFPR was deferred until the next meeting
7. Discussion of a new referral regarding the Wang Award was deferred until the next meeting

8. Time Certain 3:30: The committee discussed the Borrowed Faculty referral with Provost Andy Feinstein. Chair Peter discussed his meeting with Deputy Provost to review scenarios regarding borrowed faculty. CZ agreed that there needs to be a rationale way for compensation to departments. Encourage sharing faculty and not discourage faculty. If depts. believe that loaning /borrowing faculty will result in a budgetary hit they will not encourage depts., to do so.

   The provost agreed that standard policies and procedures for compensating departments who "loan" faculty to other programs is needed to encourage more cross discipline /department collaboration. The provost will discuss this issue with the Council of Deans and task the Deans to identify strategies to encourage cross-college sharing. The goal is to incentive programs to continue to share faculty and to clarify remuneration

Professional Standards Committee
Agenda

Meeting 10: December 4 , 2017
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes to be taken by Seat B: Chin

Members (Seats A-K): M. Kimbarow, J. Chin, S. He, R. Marachi, S. Hamedi-Hagh, A. McKee, B. White, K. Peter (chair), A. Donahue

Absent: P. Kauppila

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes of Nov 29 (Kimbarrow)
3. Amendments: Chairs and Directors Policy.
    a. Peters incorporated changes discussed at last PS meeting into policy
    b. 3.8.1 rephrased to eliminate proportionality requirements
    c. 3.8.2 revised to include PRTB clarifications, keeping all votes consistent across T/TT, FERP and PRTB
    d. Kimbarow waiting for information about joint appointments to make final decision on votes for home department
        i. Other option is to return to proportionality for all faculty
    e. Concern about fairness in giving full vote to FERP and PRTB
        i. There are differences in level of engagement in departments
        ii. Options would be to stay consistent with voting rights policy passed by O&G/Senate (full vote) for other voting instances or come up with new voting policy based on proportionality for permanent faculty
        iii. Suggestion to remove “rights” from voting rights to make distinction from association with established Voting Rights Policy
            1. PS agreed to change 3.8 to Voting for Chair Nominees
        iv. Other side of argument: FERP have earned the right to a full vote; implementation of proportionality would require information about rounding votes to protect voting anonymity
        v. Vote: full vote for everyone or proportionality

    f. He moves to redraft proposal to include proportionality for FERP and PRTB; Marachi seconds
        i. Discussion about whether proportionality would refer to home dept faculty, such as FERP and PRTB as opposed to joint appointments (3.8.2)
        ii. Reasons against: senate already voted and voiced opinion about giving FERP full vote (in favor); currently this applies to curriculum but not chairs and director votes, which leaves us with the question of whether to have two voting procedures (one separate for C&D)
    g. VOTE: 5-4 (For proportionality)
        i. Peters will redraft with proportionality; fix 3.8.2 and section on rounding votes
4. Updates: Transparency and Accountability reforms (Coordinator Policy); Information privacy policy; Staff awards; Borrowed faculty; all awaiting meetings/feedback/reports
5. BAFPR reforms: Academic Freedom committee
    a. PS agreed to split underlying substantive BAFPR policy and align with proposed split of committee. Substance and structure for each section/committee would be separated out and imported accordingly: (1) board of academic freedom (structure and substance) and 2) professional responsibility (structure and substance).
    b. Peters distributed draft for PS review
    c. PS reviewed membership of committee, terms, and charge
    d. Suggestion to remove specific names of offices to preserve flexibility
    e. Staggered terms for continuity
    f. Discussion of how to include office or person of Chief Diversity Officer (CDO) Kathy Wong Lau?
    g. Peters looked up member voting for special agencies and include as appropriate to draft, Bylaw 10.2, 10.3
    h. Student involvement: question of whether to create a student slot to be filled by Associated Students
        i. Would they be interested?
6. New referral: Wang award
    a. Question is whether to fold these awards into current campus awards policy or create separate policy specifically for Wang awards
        i. Primary difference between other campus awards and Wang awards is that the Wang awards are system-wide; each campus chooses campus nominees for different categories to put

forward in state-wide competition; nominees ultimately determined by President

ii. Issue with folding into SJSU awards is the chance of Wang award criteria changing and falling out of line with SJSU awards
    1. Folding Wang awards into SJSU awards policy might only be worthwhile if the categories are relatively stable; Peters will investigate

iii. PS reviewed current criteria published by Chancellor's Office

iv. One option moving forward: write generic policy about Wang awards procedures and aligning them with current SJSU awards policy

7. New business
    a. None
8. Updates (cont from #4 (above))
    a. Information Privacy Policy
        i. Policy was passed unanimously by Senate. Currently waiting for endorsement from President. Though much information was gathered and admin feedback was gathered prior to developing policy, the policy is currently in limbo—no movement after having passed it to President.
        ii. Past practice: presidents have provided a memo within a month to move process forward; no memo has been provided in this case
        iii. Peters suggests writing a report to communicate major issues to campus, using information and suggestions from
            1. Quote American Association of University Professors (AAUP) documents on academic freedom and electronic communications to explain issues privacy
            2. For education purposes, we'd like to raise awareness to issues related to data mining by Google, disaggregating identified data sets, the ways in which our data are being used, how our emails can be searched and used for investigative purposes
        iv. Marachi offered to help with a special committee if needed
        v. Peters will draft a formal letter to President to request specific feedback regarding delay in signing policy and suggestions to move policy forward. Letter will be signed by all PC members.
9. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes

Meeting 11: January 29, 2018
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes taken by Seat C: He

1. Call to Order at 2pm.

   Presents: Ken Peter, Michael Kimbarow, Jessica Chin, Steven He, Roxana Marachi, Paul Kauppila, Alison Mckee, Brandon White, Armani Donahue.

   Absents: none

2. Approval of minutes of December 4.

3. Disposal of Referrals:

   a. Coordinator Policy
      - Feedback relayed by Deputy Provost from Deans: "While there was support for the goals of the policy to promote transparency and opportunity, the deans were concerned about the creation of a policy because there was no clear way to delineate a distinct class of positions governed by it and because the policy was seen as potentially infringing on the flexibility needed by the chair to get work done."
      - There is no policy regulating this in decades and it would be a cultural shift if we could push for it. We tried different ways but were not able to write a specific language that defines exactly who will be covered and that was why we requested the feedback from Deans.
      - We can continue to pursue such as to request feedback from UCCD or simply give it up because of the resistance. Committee finally agrees to close this referral.

   b. Borrowed Faculty (O&G S17-2)
      - Feedback from Deputy Provost: "Bradley Olin, Walt Jacobs, and Shannon Miller are working on a draft to bring before the deans so that we can formalize and institutionalize the practices in this realm to support interdisciplinary endeavors and improve consistency. Unfortunately, the last deans' meeting of the month (Dec-21) was cancelled due to vacation schedules but we expect to wrap it up in January. I did ask them to keep you in the loop."

- We will leave this open and wait for the draft.

c. F81-7
   - If there is no utility in this document, we should prepare a policy recommendation to rescind it. Michael will take a look at the details and report back in the next meeting.

4. S88-5 (Stray SOLATE policy?)
   - Sent to SERB for feedback but probably needs to be rescinded since F12-6 consolidated all teaching evaluation policies.
   - Ken will bring a formal policy recommendation to rescind this next time.
   - The new SOTEs software has removed the range of the norm and report only a single number. We are not sure whether this will cause some problems. Many departments relied upon that range. In addition, the current SOTEs fail to report the evaluations to be listed according to the grades. Ken has sent the comments to the Provost, IEA, and SERB.

5. Staff awards PS-F17-1.
   - Policy recommendation amending S13-6 to add a university staff award to our campus awards policy was presented to ExCom for feedback. We are waiting for the President's reaction before we move forward to widely consult with staff. We can deal with staff awards and the Wang Award in the same time to amend the policy just once.
   - Having the university staff award can reduce the needs to set up special process for the Wang award. Given that the CSU puts the staff award along with other awards, we could add the staff award policy together with other categories.

6. Wang Award Policy PS-F17-2.
   - May consider to add something like the following paragraph to the awards policy as a new section at the end, so that it will be flexible enough and would not have to be amended every time the Wang policy changes.

IX. System Awards. From time to time the CSU requests nominees for various system-wide awards (e.g., the Wang awards.) The Chair of the Senate, in consultation with the President and the Executive Committee, shall issue internal campus nomination procedures that coordinate such awards with SJSU awards as much as possible. When the criteria for a system award parallels that of an internal SJSU award, the President shall consider the pool of potential nominees to be the last three SJSU awardees in that category. When the criteria for a system award is not matched by a corresponding SJSU award, a special committee shall be constituted, composed of members of the previous year's award committees, that shall recommend several unranked choices for each external award to the President.

   - There could be some people who has never applied for campus awards but are still eligible for the Wang award.
   - May still need to have a Wang committee to determine whether or not the previous awardees to be the potential nominees.

- We don't want to have five committees just for the Wang award. But if we just have one committee, it will be less expert and less knowledgeable than the existing campus committee.
- Will have a special award committee every year composed of members from the previous year's campus award committees. This committee will be charged to consider the previous three years' winners in each category plus any additional self-nominees.
- Ken will bring a revised paragraph next time.

7. BAFPR reform.
    - Academic freedom component will be separated from the professional responsibility component. The content and the committee structure are unified in these two separate policies.

8. Information Privacy; feedback, or not.
    - The letter to the President was sent a week ago. The issue was also brought to the ExCom today. We are waiting for the President's response.

9. Question on Bullying.
    - A faculty member corresponded with Ken a couple of times about whether the university policy or professional responsibility policy concerns with bullying. It is the issue about the campus climates. It can be just crazy people out of control, but very functional. What do you do when a faculty member is making another faculty member miserable, but it isn't sexual harassment and has nothing to do with RTP? Where does this discipline come in and how is it function? CFA cannot do it very well, because all faculty rights are protected and that person goes to the CFA too.
    - Professional responsibility policy does set standards which would theoretically address it, but how do we enforce it?
    - In California, work place bullying is also defined as misconduct. It should be going to HR. It also could fall in the hostile work environment.
    - Alison and Roxana will start drafting the resolution on bullying. Hopefully we can bring the first reading in March.

10. New business
    - Michael proposed a new business related to the late add. According to the current policy, there is a possibility to submit some materials to be evaluated for RTP performance review after the deadline. The materials have to be materials that only become available after the deadline. If the late add committee accepts the materials, the whole Dossier should go back down the line and start over again. Currently the committee just checks the dates. We may need to give the late add committee more instructions on what kinds of materials will be allowed and why. Candidates need to provide a strong justification when they submit the late add. Ken will try to bring a draft for the next meeting.

11. Adjourn at 4:00pm

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes from February 5th, 2018 Meeting

Meeting 12: February 5, 2018
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Members present: Chin, Donahue, He, Kauppila, Kimbarow, Marachi, McKee, Peter

1. Meeting was called to order and minutes from January 29 were approved

2. Funds for Faculty Service
    a. In case of appeal, appeals committee has to be created with two members of Professional Standards Committee. Alison McKee and Jessica Chin volunteered to serve on this appeals committee should it be necessary.

3. F81-7 GRIF draft amendments. (GRIF = Grant Related Instructional Faculty)
    a. History of GRIF was discussed and amendments were made regarding updates to process for determining GRIF awards. Balance was suggested to not circumvent process yet to to ensure some kind of review. Two different tiers of approvals were discussed for new and continuing faculty. Section I was recommended to be simplified, revised, and reviewed for future consideration.
    b. Discussion centered on specifics related to following section *"No appointment may be made without the recommendation of the appropriate faculty committee(s) and administrator(s) in the unit to which the appointment is made, and without the approval of the Academic Vice President Provost and the President."*

4. S88-5 (Stray SOLATE policy). Rescission policy recommendation was moved and approved. 8-0 Approval.

5. Staff awards and Wang award amendments to S13-6

    Main changes were an addition to Section 11 System Awards at the end. (See document)
    a. Several conditions were discussed, including need to balance review and ensure no conflicts of interest if people on special committee might be eligible for the award. Committee members must have received the award more than three years ago in order to be eligible. Draft would be revised and revisited.

6. BAFPR Reform Policies
    a. We discussed the merging of committee policies with procedural policies for both the Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility committees.
    b. Academic Freedom would be more straightforward while Professional Responsibility would be far more complex and take longer. PR policy would need updating for conflicts of interest. Both would need a "good thorough overhaul" in

light of everything that has happened. Pieces of it will be structurally merged for next meetings.

7. Subcommittee on Bullying research and SOS: Marachi, Donahue, McKee.

   Meeting is set for February 26th for sub-committee to meet and discuss exploration of current policies, what other universities are doing, and possible drafting of Sense of Senate resolution related to professional conduct and bullying behaviors. Areas of exploration would include communication of agreed upon definitions, resources, and roles of witnesses.

8. New referral PS-S18-2 regarding eligibility for service on URTP committee without having previously been elected to serve on College RTP Committee.

   Focus of discussion was that the year of experience and election to the college committee is valuable as a precursor to serving on the University committee (even for people who have served in other universities). The principle behind the current policy is to ensure that RTP reviewers are familiar with college level guidelines and standards including the unique perspectives of faculty within review committees. It was agreed upon that collective review of dossiers with a committee is a different experience than individual review of dossiers. Referral was not recommended to move forward. 8-0.

9. No new business items were brought forward.

10. The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Roxana Marachi

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES – February 19, 2018 2:00PM-4:00PM

Clark 445

Chair: Ken Peter

Present: Chin, Donahue, He, Kauppila, Kimbarow, Marachi, McKee, Peter, White

1. Minutes from the Feb. 5th meeting will be available at the Mar. 5th meeting.

   Brief informational items:
   - Senate passed policy updating SOTEs and SOLATEs
   - Still waiting for feedback from the President's office on our proposed Information Privacy policy
   - Language was corrected on election rules after referral from University RTP committee

2. Review of Nursing RTP guidelines:

   The School of Nursing submitted their guidelines for the third time, but there are still issues with this submission. The committee was reluctant to send the guidelines back a third time. A more diplomatic approach might be to invite some members of the Nursing faculty to one of our meetings to discuss the guidelines.

   While one section of the document provides a number that SOTEs and SOLATEs should not fall below, that number is contradicted elsewhere in the document. In several areas it seems as if university policy is being quoted directly but this is not made clear.

   The committee questioned some of the Baseline bullet points. In other areas the University policy described a certain activity as "Good," when in the Nursing guidelines the same activity was described as "Baseline." The committee also questioned whether some of the bullet points were in the most appropriate categories. One committee member suggested quoting directly from the university policy instead of paraphrasing. Nursing faculty members will be invited to the next Professional Standards meeting.

3. Senate Policy 81-7: Appointment Procedures for Grant-Related Instructional Faculty of Exceptional Merit (abbreviated to GRIF)

   The committee discussed updating the dated GRIF policy. The committee suggested removing mention of colleges and departments and focusing instead on faculty, administrators, and committees.

Apparently SJSU has just two GRIF positions, out of less than 100 in the CSU system as a whole. GRIF faculty typically earn 5% to 35% additional salary (privately funded, not state money.)

The committee suggested simplifying section 2.2 by only mentioning the faculty member, the committee, the provost, and the president. The committee discussed whether the appointment process should be separated from the GRIF policy itself. Though faculty must recommend GRIF faculty, does the president have the right to go against the faculty recommendation? Several minor language changes were suggested. It was observed that the president is less likely to approve policy revisions that are more restrictive than the previous policy.

The committee then voted unanimously to incorporate the changes for a first Senate reading.

4. Wang/staff awards:

   Should the Wang and proposed staff awards policies be separated? The committee would like to gather feedback from staff but have been waiting to hear from the president's chief of staff since last fall. The committee discussed how to deal with lack of response from administration on proposed policies.

5. Academic Freedom committee

   This policy moves academic freedom out of Senate policy S99-9 into its own policy. A discussion ensued on committee membership. The Professional Standards Committee generally agreed that Academic Freedom committee members be able to serve a maximum of three consecutive two-year terms, after which time they must rotate off the committee for at least one term. The Professional Standards Committee approved a first reading of this proposed policy at the next Senate meeting.

6. Bullying subcommittee

   This subcommittee will meet on Mon., Feb. 26th.

7. New business

   There was a brief discussion of a possible "data ethics" canvas for SJSU business and corporate partners and other non-campus entities.

   The meeting was then adjourned.

   Respectfully submitted,

   Paul Kauppila

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes

Meeting 14: March 5, 2018
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Present: Kenneth Peter, Brandon White, Roxanna Marachi, Alison McKee, Steven He, Michael Kimbarow, Paul Kauppila, Jessica Chin, Armani Donahue, Jae-Ho Pyeon

1. Call to Order at 2:02pm.
2. Minutes approved from the last two meetings (Feb 5 and Feb 19).
3. Introduction of new committee member, Jae-Hoe Pyeon.
4. Review of Nursing Guidelines before guests arrive.
    a. This is nursing's third attempt at creating guidelines. They have made considerable progress but there are still inconsistencies in them that create ambiguity and questions. Senator Peter had compiled a list of things that is made up from his reading as well as feedback from PS. For scholarship, is it possible to tenure a faculty member without a single peer reviewed publication? Too much overlap between some of the sections. Academic assignment appears to have scholarship listed (under excellent) and service requirements that should be moved to the respective categories.

    b. Discussion with Nursing guests Colleen O'Leary-Kelley (Chair Nursing), Daryl Canham (Chair Personnel Committee, Nursing).
        i. Advanced practice nurses teach and also hold a clinical practice and so guidelines came about because of clarification the clinical side and how that relates to RTP. Tenure-Track faculty all have 4/4 teaching loads and if clinical, they also have an outside clinical appointment. The clinical appointment is by choice as it is not a requirement when the faculty member is hired. Students do not work with the nursing faculty in their clinical practice.
        ii. Do letters of appointment include requirements to maintain advanced clinical certification? This is important because it helps understand where this might go in an RTP process. Not sure if it is in the letter.
        iii. Is school of nursing accreditation dependent on advanced practice? No, only maintain regular practice. All faculty must have regular practice licensure. Advanced practice is not required for accreditation.
        iv. Should you have two sets of guidelines for two different tracks (clinical separate from teaching)? Hard to determine.
        v. The No votes for the guidelines were concerns about too much for good and excellent categories for RSCA.
        vi. RSCA Criteria discussion.

1. Baseline: Could a faculty get baseline without peer-reviewed publication? Some nursing and healthcare journals are not referred but are widely used in practice. Can have an external review of non-referred articles (or reviewed by personal committee). The guests did not think that was what was meant and that this could be corrected.
2. Good, distinguish what was in Baseline separate from the additional materials to achieve good. (same for excellent)
3. Good, why participation on a steering committee/national task force is RSCA and not service.
4. For RSCA, consider making peer- reviewed publications a separate required item and then everything else in another category and certain number selected in addition to peer-reviewed publication.

vii. Service
1. Under excellent, everything requires documentation to make it clear.
2. Under good and excellent, serve/participating on committees, there is no distinction unless it is distinguishing international work for excellent. What makes it excellent vs good? (University policy makes a distinction)

viii. Academic Assignment-For SOTES/SOLATES, refer to the norms rather than a number.

5. Staff awards and Wang award amendments
   a. Report of meeting with Chief of Staff Jaye Bailey. She recommended to remove from policy. Main reason is that staff union may have problems with this because no staff is on the senate, yet an award is being given. Staff award should arise from staff; without staff representation on the Senate such an award would be patronizing. Discussions are ensuing of possible staff council which could then recommend a staff award.
   b. Agreement on the need to have procedures for system awards without including Staff. The policy has been edited to remove staff. Vote to move forward to the senate for first reading at next senate meeting. Pass 10-0-0.
6. Subcommittee on bullying research. Committee met last week and minutes were sent to committee to review. Meeting included Kathy Wong-Lau and lecturer (anonymous; for sensitivity). Will be explorer documents from other universities who have started to address this (Wisconsin and Berkeley both have documents that should be reviewed). Professional Responsibility Policy that committee is currently working on could be applicable. In student community, not much talk about bullying but more focus on cyber bullying.
   a. Next steps will be to look at our policy and compare to Berkeley and Wisconsin documents and do a basic gap analysis.
   b. Do a sense of the senate resolution for next Fall.
7. New business

    a. Roxanna brought forth information on “Data Ethics Canvas”. Committee should read and review for next meeting. Consider doing a sense of the senate resolution on this but too early in the process.
8. Adjourn-4:00pm

Professional Standards
March 19, 2018 2PM – 4PM
Minutes – Seat K: Donahue

Present: Kenneth Peter, Roxanna Marachi, Alison McKee, Steven He, Michael Kimbarow, Paul Kauppila, Jessica Chin, Armani Donahue, and Jae-Ho

1. Call to Order: 2:03PM
2. Approval of minutes
    a. of March 5 (White)
3. Review of Psychology Guidelines
    a. The Scholarly portion looks elaborate; matrix for scholarly, artistic and professional
        i. Their baselines are appropriate! The core essentials are divided well per matrix level. Overall, very clear for non-psychology disciplines to understand their needs.
        ii. How can you measure impact exactly?
            1. Included alternate mea
        iii. Some repeated language from University policy.
        iv. RSCA & RTP mixed language
    b. MOVED: K. Peter Second:
        i. AVP of Faculty Affairs approves Psychology guidelines: Approved Unanimously 7- 0 – 0
4. Redrafting of Academic Freedom policy following first reading
    a. Forgot to put a rational originally
        i. Supreme Court decision that supported the additions of an AF committee (1950's)
        ii. Last paragraph: not essential, but for the future. Can be nice for people to see how the committee is planned to look. Might be too outdated once it's put into effect, but it will provide context for others to reference later!
    b. Changes
        i. 3.1 basically same
        ii. 3.2 how committees will get chairs
        iii. 3.3 who do they report to
        iv. 3.4 how exec goes for screening and recommending candidates
    c. Committee should be aware of different legal actions in the past/academic freedom *anything*, but do not offer legal advice
    d. Be framed as a resource, but not tailored to legal support
        i. 2.1.2: period after "freedom"
    e. Student and Grad student (1 only > 1 each) on the committee

i. Associated Students restructure additions?
ii. Maybe be political science screened/preferred
iii. Grad and undergrad provide two different perspectives

f. DUTIES: forum, faculty orientation = student voice would be great

5. Subcommittee on bullying research; see Professional Responsibility policy (attached)
    a. McKee: looked at different policies
        i. Berkeley and comprehensive study (Madison), Colorado State
            1. Looked at definitions
            2. Looked at protected categorized people
                a. Did not include anyone not working for university
                    i. Title IX cannot hold unprotected accountable either (whereas) → resolved, this may/WILL protect your category
            3. Enforce and address – sense of senate resolution > policy
                a. Nature and sources of problems
                b. Look at campus climate surveys
                c. Quote from sources for definitions and statistics
                d. Goal: suggest best practices, next steps, maybe add them to faculty conduct papers of some kind
                    i. Amy Strange // Faculty Diversity
            4. Include: Online, face-to-face, student-on-student, faculty-on-student, etc
            5. Meeting date: TBD
6. SOS on Information Privacy response
    a. Committee to President: please respond within a year → consideration for the top of the pile
7. New business
    a. Marachi: Information Ethics and Data Merging
        i. SJSU some policies something granting access
        ii. Digital data, psychological profiling
        iii. Especially 3rd party org/sites outside of SJSU having access/sharing data
            1. Find analysis of what exactly is being used and hopefully/maybe why.
        iv. Why are **Gmail/SOTES/eFaculty/Canvas**/Student Success Collaborative (CSU Wide)/Smart Boards merging?
            1. What other institutions may use these, why, and what are their issues?
            2. Grades First: looks at data
                a. Library and EOP use it
        v. Sense of Senate > Policy

vi. Do these go to **Information Security Officer, Chief Information Officer**, Jay __, Andy Feinstein, Siggert(?), someone in Engineering that has understanding (interoperability)
vii. Keeper of these policies: Jennifer Red(d)

8. Adjourn: 3:45PM

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes

Meeting 15: March 30, 2018
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Present: Kenneth Peter, Brandon White, Roxanna Marachi, Alison McKee, Steven He, Michael Kimbarow, Paul Kauppila, Jessica Chin, Armani Donahue,
Absent: Jae-Ho Pyeon

1. The meeting was called to order at 2:05
2. Minutes of 3/5/18 were approved
3. Review of revised and resubmitted ChAD Guidelines: The committee reviewed and discussed the resubmitted guidelines and recommended that the Interim AVPFA return them (with the committee's feedback) to the department for further clarification and revision.
4. Redrafting of the Academic Freedom policy: Subsequent to the Fist Reading in the Senate, Chair Peter presented a draft revision of the policy for the committee to review and discuss. The modifications were unanimously endorsed by the committee (8-0-2 absent). The revised policy recommendation will be presented to the Senate for final vote on April 9, 2018.
5. Subcommittee on bullying research: No update at this time.
6. Update on Data Ethics Inquiry: No update. Chair Peter is waiting for information from CIO Bob Lim re: privacy provisions in existing technology contracts.
7. The meeting was adjourned at 3:50

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes

Meeting 17: April 16, 2018
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Present: Jessica Chin, Armani Donahue Steven He, Michael Kimbarow, Roxanna Marachi, Alison McKee, Kenneth Peter (Chair), Jae-Ho Pyeon

Regrets: Paul Kauppila, Brandon White

Minutes taken by Seat B: Jessica Chin

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of minutes
    a. of March 19 (Donahue)-approved
    b. of April 2 (Kimbarow)-approved
3. Review of Mexican American Studies (MAS) Guidelines
    a. Peter reviewed his comments on submitted guidelines
    b. PS discussed suggested revisions
    c. Need vote from MAS dept
    d. Introduction provides useful information
    e. Suggestions to strengthen guidelines
        i. Provide recommendation to contextualize information
        ii. Use and quote university descriptors rather than re-write them, then provide examples
        iii. Provide guidelines for attaining external reviews for non-peer-reviewed work, since guidelines allow for non-peer-reviewed scholarship
        iv. Provide more specific examples for baseline, good, and excellent
    f. Kimbarow will provide PS feedback to MAS
4. Redrafting of GRIF policy
    a. Amended version includes changes to Appointment procedures--making 2.3 language parallel with 1.3 regarding fund grantors
    b. Vote to approve amended version to go for final reading at Senate.
        i. Vote 8-0
5. Redrafting of System Awards amendment
    a. VIII.D. giving committee authority to answer the question of who determines when a system award parallels an internal SJSU award
    b. VIII.C.ii. if prior recipient is retired, this would mean a retired faculty member could serve on the committee (concern raised by P. Stacks)
        i. The executive committee would still have final say over award committee member which could keep this concern in check

c. "Oscar problem"—concern over diversity of awardees and recipients (concern raised by J. Lee)
    i. Exec Comm can keep discussions open about diversity when approving award committee members
    ii. Peter will draft language providing direction for selection committee to consider diversity when selecting committee members
d. Defining "faculty member" to include Student Service Professionals (SPSS) who may not teach and cannot become a tenured faculty member; classified as faculty by senate (not Unit 3)
    i. Peter will add language to include this classification of faculty to be eligible for service award

6. Subcommittee on bullying research
    a. Discussion of focus of Sense of Senate Resolution
        i. what type of bullying do we focus on? focus on those represented on and by Senate, standpoint of university
        ii. include quotes from other university bullying policies
        iii. plan to introduce in Fall 2018
7. Update on Data Ethics inquiry
    a. Privacy summary sent from ISO Mike Cook via the CIO
        i. Document sent to PS: "Security and Privacy Protection for Third Party Services Storing Confidential Information"
        ii. This document includes generic, general guidelines
        iii. Details about privacy agreements were not shared
        iv. Concern expressed over gaps in policy and evidence of predictive analytics and data mining being used through apps and software used by SJSU, e.g. Canvas and Canvas app (appcensus.mobi)
        v. PS will invite Chief Information Officer (CIO) and Information Security Officer (ISO) to meet and discuss privacy policies further ; PS will request to see standard privacy agreements (more than general summary)
8. New business
    a. Mini-review (annual RTP) issue referred to PS
        i. The issue is that there is a gap between some review periods that aren't included in certain review periods. i.e., missing information from end of third and start of 4th review. Need to adjust policy to include all material lost in the gap.
        ii. To resolve the issue, the document needs to more carefully define period for annual performance review (/mini review)
            1. Peter will work on this language
9. Adjourn

Professional Standards Committee
Minutes

Meeting 18: April 23, 2018
Clark Hall 445
2:00-4:00 PM

Minutes taken by Seat C: He

1. Call to Order and introductions at 2pm.

   Presents: Ken Peter, Michael Kimbarow, Jessica Chin, Steven He, Roxana Marachi, Jae-Ho Pyeon, Paul Kauppilla, Alison McKee, Brandon White, Armani Donahue.

2. Approval of minutes of April 16.

3. Update on Data Ethics inquiry and follow up on Information Privacy recommendation

   - Visited by Information Security Officer Mike Cook, Information Security Analyst Hien Huynh, and Senate Chair Stefan.
   - Mike answered questions on the regulations and issues on security and privacy protection for third party services storing confidential information.
     - Canvas has to abide by our agreement with Canvas and the agreement indicates that no third party should have access to our information.
     - When a new third party application wants to add on Canvas or any other university systems to access our information, it triggers our approval process.
     - We don't have big level I data breaches so far, but FERPA violations are much more frequently.
     - Will share the provisions with PS.
   - It sounds legally okay, but it is in fact difficult to enforce the legal agreements.
   - Mike will attempt to have conversation with the President and Bob to discuss the information privacy policy and provide input to PS.
   - Written code of ethics of IT administrators may be an option.
   - Option 1 is to accept the President's edits for immediate vote and option 2 is to wait in case Mike finds out what the President is willing to work on some Presidential Directive or modification of the policy. The committee decides to wait and will discuss it in the Fall.

4. Amendment S15-7 Amending S15-7 (RTP Procedures) Clarifying the period of review for Periodic "Annual" Reviews for Probationary Faculty

- We don't really have a clear definition on what the annual summaries for periodic "annual" reviews cover. So far it might only cover for that academic year or the two prior semesters.
- Will amend to "since the last review" to eliminate the gap between each review.
- Late add shouldn't be considered as double dipping and won't change the period of review.
- Vote to approve the policy recommendation for final reading at Senate (Vote: 10-0-0).

5. Redrafting of System Awards amendment.

    - Language is added in two places regarding diversity: II.C.1 and VIII.C.iv.
    - Student Service Professional employee are added to be eligible for service award and changes incurred in three places.
    - The awards are not in balance and we could consider to suggest to add more lecturer awards.
    - Vote to approve the amended version to forward to Senate as final reading (Vote: 10-0-0).

6. Subcommittee on bullying research

    No updates

7. New business

    None

8. Adjourn at 3:55pm.