

## 2016-2017 Year-End Committee Report Form

**Committee:** Curriculum & Research

**Chair:**

Ravisha Mathur

**Chair-Elect for 2016-2017:**

Winifred Schultz-Krohn  
4-3077/0059/winifred.schultz-krohn@sjsu.edu

**Number of Meetings held: 18**

August 29, 2016  
September 12, 2016  
September 19, 2016  
October 3, 2016  
October 17, 2016  
November 7, 2016  
November 14, 2016  
November 28, 2016  
December 5, 2016  
January 30, 2017  
February 6, 2017  
February 20, 2017  
March 6, 2017  
March 20, 2017  
April 3, 2017  
April 17, 2017  
April 24, 2017  
May 8, 2017

(Please include phone/zip/email if available)

### Items of Business Completed 2015/2016

**Curriculum**

1. Recommended Approval: MS, Family Nurse Practitioner Program (Special Sessions)
2. Recommended Approval: MS, Bioinformatics
3. Recommended Approval: Minor, Bioinformatics
4. Recommended Approval: 3 minors in Environmental Studies
5. Recommended Approval: Minor, Applied Computing for Behavioral and Social Sciences
6. Recommended Approval: BA, Mexican American Studies

**Name Changes:**

7. Recommended Approval: Department name change from RTVF to Film and Theatre
8. Recommended Approval: Degree name change from BS, Health Science to BS, Public Health
9. Recommended Approval: Department name change from HSPM to Hospitality, Tourism, and Event Management

**Discontinuations:**

10. Recommended Discontinuation: MA, Theatre Arts
11. Recommended Discontinuation: BA, Creative Arts Preparation for Teaching
12. Recommended Discontinuation: 3 BS, Environmental Studies concentrations
13. Recommended Discontinuation: Minor, Environmental Studies

**Discussion/Review Items:**

14. Made recommendations to GUP regarding unit change proposals.
15. Discussed concerns with GE Pathways and noted that the campus needs more discussion before implementation.

16. Discussed concerns with VP, Innovation and Research and noted that the campus needs more clarification on this additional administrator position

**Organized Research & Training Units (ORTUs):**

1. Reviewed and recommended approval for: People and Performance Analytics
2. Reviewed and recommended approval for: Study of Sport, Society and Social Change
3. Reviewed and recommended discontinuation for: Biodiversity Center

**Policy Recommendations and Referrals**

1. Closed: WST referral to remove WST requirement for 100W for graduate students, change was made procedurally within GUP, no policy change is required
2. Revision of Internships, Service Learning, and Off-Campus Learning Experiences Policy (Sent to the President, on hold)
3. Revision of RSCA policy (referred back to committee after Senate vote)
4. Program Planning Policy Recommendation (sent to the President)
5. University Learning Goals Policy Recommendation (sent to the President)

**Unfinished Business Items for 2016/2017**

1. Finish changes to Program Planning Guidelines
2. Clarifying Risk Management within Internship Policy recommendation
3. Department Name Change policy referral
4. Submit Curriculum Policy Referral
5. Work on Blended (3+2, 4+1) Policy Referral
6. Meet with CDO to hand off Diversity Referral

**New Business Items for 2017/2018**

1. Reviewing and updating C&R orientation guide for new members.
2. Reviewing S14-9: Guidelines for Concentrations to align with changes in the Chancellor's office.

**Please return to the Office of the Academic Senate (ADM 176/0024) by May 31, 2017.**

## **Curriculum & Research**

### **Agenda**

Monday, August 29, 2016

2pm-4pm, SH 331

1. Approval of last meeting minutes AY15/16 (5/2/16).
2. Review of last year's work and outcomes.

#### **Policy**

##### **3. Policy Referrals**

4. Referral on RSCA (Referral, Draft)

Time Certain 2:30pm: Dr. Gilles Muller, Associate Dean, Office of Research

#### **Curriculum**

5. Review of revised Family-Nurse Practitioner Special Sessions proposal.

**Curriculum & Research**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
Monday, August 29, 2016  
2pm-4pm, SH 331

**Present:** Thalia Anagnos, Peter Buzanski, Shelley Cargill, Megan Chang, Richard Chung, Scott Heil, Ravisha Mathur, Toby Matoush, Pamela Stacks, Lynne Trulio

**Absent:** Beverly Grindstaff, Natalya Balal

**Guests:** Gilles Muller (Associate Dean, Office of Research)

**Start:** 2:03 pm

1. Approval of previous minutes (5-2-16)

**\*\*ACTION-** Approved Meeting Minutes from May 2, 2016: **5-Yes, 0-No- 4-Abstain**

2. Reviewed last year's work and outcomes

- a. Last academic year the committee reviewed 15 curricular items including new programs, department name changes, and degree terminations.
- b. We took 7 policy recommendations to the senate, and 6 were passed (signed by the president). One was dropped by our committee.

3. Reviewed current referrals

- a. C&R has five current referrals. We can decide if we want to pursue the referral or not. We can also develop our own draft policy recommendation or use a draft when submitted with the referral.
- b. Members discussed F15-7 Review Curricular Options addressing Diversity Education. The new CDO has a taskforce on diversity and we want to ensure that we are not re-duplicating efforts. It would be worthwhile to coordinate efforts with this taskforce.
- c. Discussed program planning referral and some of the next steps with this referral.
- d. Other items to consider would be to review Chancellor's office recommendations regarding concentrations. A new executive order will be coming out and C&R can consider whether a change is needed in policy or not.
- e. Discussion of coded memo regarding C- in four basic GE categories. Chancellor's office is establishing a workgroup on the issue and we will wait until we hear from that group prior to changing any policies.

4. GUP Form Update: With the new certificate policy, is the current form on the GUP site accurate? No, GUP will work to update this form. Just met last week to discuss the certificate implementation.

5. Discussion and preliminary feedback on RSCA draft policy

- a. Gilles discussed the history of the referral and need for revised policy and reviewed a proposed plan of action and some of the critical items to review.

- b. Discussion of the need for a single PI (has expertise, but also has fiscal responsibility in a grant).
- c. The draft should be re-titled to note that this is RSCA through Sponsored programs and then include a third paragraph to note that this policy refers to sponsored projects on campus. But there are other elements that are linked to general conduct of research on campus in the policy?
- d. Under Proposal Submission section add in a category for administrator.
- e. Discussion of Adjunct Professor as PI. Perhaps follow what is done in practice currently to allow these faculty the opportunity.
- f. The policy should include a section on Co-PIs (e.g., who can be a Co-PI, can students be a Co-PI).
- g. Include a distinction between a thesis vs. project in terms of proprietary information.
- h. Discussion of plan of action and next steps. Gilles will develop some revision to this draft and attend our Sept. 12th meeting for feedback. C&R will further polish the draft for Sept. 19th meeting and then begin to take it out to faculty, UCCD, committees to gather additional feedback.

6. Michael Kimbarow, Chair of the Academic Senate, visited the committee to welcome the members to their new senate role.

7. Revised, MS, Family Nurse Practitioner Program (Special Sessions)

- a. New side-by-side comparison is in the google drive. There was a course error in the revised version.
- b. Question was posed as to what needs to be included when comparing to other programs (i.e., does the cost of the program need to be included?). CIES does need this financial comparison when determining the budget. It is also something the Chancellor's office requests.
- c. It was noted that the Coursework section in the proposal has errors in it. For example, the text in the proposal states that the program has 41 units, but there are 42 units. Table in the proposal has errors in the coursework.

**\*\*ACTION-** Approved, pending minor changes (Coursework section and accurate dates in proposal). **10-Yes, 0-No- 0-Abstain**

8. Next meeting we will focus on Program Planning and RSCA. Scott will have some new information to present to the committee regarding Program Planning.

**Adjourned** 3:51 pm

## **Curriculum & Research**

### **Agenda**

Monday, September 12, 2016

2pm-4pm, SH 331

1. Approval of last meeting minutes (8/29/16).
2. RSCA policy recommendation draft discussion
  - a. Time Certain 2:05pm Gilles Muller, Associate Dean, Office of Research
  - b. Review items in the folder: Revised RSCA draft, RSCA referral
3. Program Planning (PP) policy referral discussion
  - a. Discussion of PP purpose, goals, organization, process, and timeline for policy recommendation development.
  - b. Scott Heil, Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics, Mock-up Report
  - c. Review items in the folder: Current SJSU policies surrounding PP process (3), PP Referral, Current PP Guidelines, Current template, Draft policy recommendation and guidelines from last academic year's program planning committee.

**Curriculum & Research**  
**Meeting Minutes**

Monday, September 12, 2016  
2pm-4pm, SH 331

**Present:** Thalia Anagnos, Natalya Balal, Peter Buzanski, Shelley Cargill, Megan Chang, Richard Chung, Beverly Grindstaff, Scott Heil, Ravisha Mathur, Toby Matoush, Simon Rodan, Lynne Trulio

**Absent:** Pamela Stacks

**Guests:** Gilles Muller (Associate Dean, Office of Research)

**Start:** 2:03 pm

1. Approval of previous minutes (8-29-16)

**\*\*ACTION-** Approved Meeting Minutes from August 29, 2016: **9-Yes, 0-No- 1-Abstain**

2. RSCA Policy

- a. Gilles is available to come and talk to groups around campus in order to answer any questions faculty may have about this revised RSCA policy.
- b. Is the terminology "Sponsored" appropriate for this policy? Should a definition be included to outline how we define what "sponsored" means in this specific policy around RSCA activities.
  - i. How are sponsored activities identified specifically within the research foundation?
  - ii. A definition section would facilitate the understanding of how the project is funded whether internal or external funded research.
  - iii. This obviously means external so let us define it that way.
- c. F69-12 is a current policy that outlines the definition of sponsored programs. This way it can facilitate all research that is conducted on campus.
- d. This policy recommendation outlines acceptable Private Investigators (PI) and Co-PI procedures.
  - i. Include eligibility of PI and Co-Pi prior to paragraph on how to submit.
  - ii. Exceptions criteria should list with the other exception criteria information.
- e. S14-10 discusses thesis embargoes which may impact this policy. We need to ensure these two policies don't conflict.
- f. Separate policies might need to be created to discuss the elements around student relationships with faculty when conducting research.
- g. The chair will create a fresh copy of this draft policy recommendation based on today's discussion for us to review next time.

3. Program Planning Policy

- a. We should discuss the process and goals for SJSU program planning.
- b. The process currently seems prescriptive and not meaningful. Departments should be looking at student success and program trends to improve educational

experience of students as opposed to just the data trends of retention and graduation.

- c. Now is a good time to determine if we are looking at the right data elements to assist our departments in improving their programs.
- d. This policy revision has been with C&R for over a year. One of the issues was that the process doesn't necessarily map onto what is actually being done in program planning and the final report.
- e. Scott has developed a mock-report of program planning data elements that are/can be distributed departments.
  - i. They have been redesigned to offer more qualitative representation of the data, highlighting the important elements of the data.
  - ii. This data easily maps out what departments can do or focus on to improve their programs.
  - iii. Numbers and visuals will be needed for those who can and want to deal with numbers and those who would rather take the data as predicted by the report and run with it. The numbers people might want to see how to manipulate their data for future predictions.
  - iv. It would be useful to track changes in majors so that departments can see how the change might impact their program and rates.
  - v. Some critical data would include average unit load and total units at graduation to see the distribution of those majors. Then we can see those who are progressing at a full-time vs part-time rate.
  - vi. Offer different templates for the different types of programs we have.
- f. We could map program planning to the Four pillars of SJSU student success.
- g. We can develop a couple of sub groups. One to review the policy and one to review the data element portion of the policy. The policy review group can start with the draft that PPC developed or start fresh.

**\*\*Action Items:** Let the chair know by Wednesday (9/14/16, 5pm) which group you are interested in participating in.

**Adjourned 3:58 pm**

# **Curriculum & Research**

## **Agenda**

Monday, September 19, 2016

2pm-4pm, SH 331

1. Approval of last meeting minutes (9/12/16).
2. Updates
3. RSCA Policy Recommendation Discussion
  - a. Overall RSCA Policy Recommendation Draft
  - b. S94-8 (Older policy)
  - c. F69-12 (Classified and Proprietary Information policy)
  - d. S14-10 (Embargoes on student theses/embargoes)
4. Review of other referrals.

**Curriculum & Research**  
**Meeting Minutes**

Monday, September 19, 2016  
2pm-4pm, SH 331

**Present:** Thalia Anagnos, Natalya Balal, Peter Buzanski, Shelley Cargill, Megan Chang, Richard Chung, Beverly Grindstaff, Scott Heil, Ravisha Mathur, Simon Rodan, Pamela Stacks, Lynne Trulio

**Absent:** Toby Matoush

**Start:** 2:10 pm

1. Set-up Program Planning SubCommittee Meeting Dates/Times
  - a. Data Elements September 28th 12-1
  - b. Program Planning Policy September 30th 1:30-3
2. Approval of previous minutes (9-12-16)
  - a. Change "Private Investigator" to "Principal Investigator"
  - b. Adding note to Item 2.f regarding the fact that "research and publications differ for Humanities and Arts."

**\*\*ACTION-** Approved Meeting Minutes as amended from September 12, 2016.

**11-Yes, 0-No- 1-Abstain**

3. Updates
  - a. No curricular proposals have been submitted, but several proposals are coming this way in October and November. We will do our best to meet the catalog deadline.
  - b. Chancellor's Office is creating guidelines for Intellectual Property and Intellectual freedom without faculty input.
  - c. Department Name Changes-
    - i. Name change history has only resided with policy when the naming convention is linked to change to a 'school' or naming of a donor for a building.
    - ii. Since no policy on campus discusses specifics about changing a department name, the discussion is should we develop policy or just have process?
      1. Consensus among senate executive committee was that a policy should be developed in order to keep consistency moving forward, and that it should run under Curriculum and Research since the name change will reflect the program offerings.
      2. Perhaps we should keep it as a process to simplify a department name change.
      3. Suggestion is that we add it to the S06-7 policy regarding merging and splitting departments this way the name change process follows the same process as merger/split

4. Suggestion that we ensure that policy does not require programs to run through more than one committee. Also suggest a limitations/timeframe on how many times, or repeat of previous titles.
  5. Referral will come from Bethany (O&G) and/or Ravisha (C&R).
- d. There will need to be a referral for an amendment to update the Off campus reporting policy (S16-14) to include a statement about the “CPT” (curricular practical training) courses being exempt from the policy requirements.
  - e. Certificate policy (S16-17) needs to be revised due to extra parenthesis in two sections of the policy. We will wait until O&G proposes a policy amendment regarding editorial changes after presidential signature.
4. RSCA Policy
- a. The recommendation was to separate out specific parts of the RSCA policy to be more clear. However, after consultation with faculty and other senators, the concern was that parts would get overlooked or confusing to newer faculty. Currently all RSCA related policies are separate policies and out of date.
    - i. Do we want to keep this as one policy or keep as individual policies?
    - ii. This policy seems more focused on SPONSORED research and does not reflect general research.
      1. Creating this to cover general vs. sponsored means we could cover students and faculty in Sponsored research.
    - iii. What is the real purpose about this policy? All RSCA activities or specifically “sponsored” programs?
    - iv. Federal policies are continuously changing, we might not want to lock ourselves into specific areas that might need to be altered as national policy updates.
    - v. Rework name to be more specific to what it will address.
    - vi. How information is disseminated should be addressed in policy.
    - vii. Motion: Stacks motioned to change title of policy to include the other pieces.
      1. Motioned seconded, discussion about name change.
  - b. There are many policies that exist that are out of date and should be revised at same time as this policy as they directly reflect or influence this policy's implementation. An example is financial conflict of interest for Principal Investigators.
    - i. AVP Stacks will draft a financial section that discusses conflict of interest with PI's.
    - ii. F08-1 Human Subjects policy edits have been in the works.
    - iii. F98-3 and S96-11 will be updated after the CSU policy comes down the line so that they can align properly. In the meantime statewide senators are making the fight to get faculty input on the CO policy.
- \*\*Vote to Approve Stacks motion: 1-Yes, 11-No- 0-Abstain**

- iv. The issue of restrictions within research activities should be addressed for both faculty and students as it is important to the student learning process for when they go out and do their own research.
- v. Need clarification on the roles around projects and student involvement.
- c. Mathur motioned that this policy connect to other RSCA policies and to reorder the current structure of draft (3-2-1). Motion seconded. Rodan suggested an amendment to change to 3-1-2 (second by Stacks): **12-Yes, 0-No- 0-Abstain**

**\*\*ACTION-** Approve moving forward in combining RSCA policy: **12-Yes, 0-No- 0-Abstain**

**\*\* Action Items-** Make final edits/suggestions by Friday so that Stacks can work from an updated draft.

**Adjourned** 3:57 pm

## **Curriculum & Research**

### **Agenda**

Monday, October 3, 2016

2pm-4pm, SH 331

1. Approval of last meeting minutes (9/19/16).
2. Updates
3. General Education Pathways
  - a. Time Certain: 2:05pm Kathleen McSharry, Associate Dean, College of the Humanities and the Arts
4. Amendment to S16-4: Policy Draft Recommendation, Referral, Policy
5. Draft Senate Referral: Department Name Change

**Curriculum & Research**  
**Meeting Minutes**

Monday, October 3, 2016  
2pm-4pm, SH 331

**Present:** Thalia Anagnos, Natalya Balal, Peter Buzanski, Shelley Cargill, Megan Chang, Richard Chung, Beverly Grindstaff, Scott Heil, Ravisha Mathur, Toby Matoush, Simon Rodan, Pamela Stacks, Lynne Trulio

**Guest:** Kathleen McSharry (HA)

**Start:** 2:05 pm

1. Approval of previous minutes (9-12-16)  
**\*\*ACTION-** Approved Meeting Minutes as amended from September 19, 2016. **10-Yes, 0-No- 1-Abstain**
2. Updates
  - a. ASCSU had a first reading for a resolution to maintain a C grade in the basic four GE categories. It will have a second reading and then be sent to the Chancellor's Office.
  - b. Task Force on Quantitative Reasoning report has been distributed and may have some curricular implications.
3. GE Pathways Project
  - a. Associate Dean McSharry just recently took on the pathways project this summer.
  - b. Idea was to create themes around general education as a means to engage students in GE around the themes generated.
  - c. Initial themes were around Sustainability, Creativity, and Global Engagement. Themes came about from early discussions about the key terms that were often used in course titles and descriptions.
  - d. There were forums that were held Spring 2016 to discuss the proposals being put together by the initiating committee.
  - e. The area themes were then assigned to a college based on theme, Humanities and Arts, College of Social Science and College of Science. There was discussion about adding Social Justice and so College of Applied Sciences and Arts will be included in future discussions.
  - f. Recent focus has been around what these "themes" actually mean. How we define them and how the curriculum will focus. For instance Creativity would revolve around "A way of thinking or seeing", Global engagement is "how we engage with other countries, borders, boundaries"
  - g. Once the key themes have been defined, forums and surveys will be conducted with faculty and students.
  - h. Next semester they will start to see what courses connect with themes and develop clusters of GE courses that will meet the definition of key theme.

- i. Looking at having this advising tool resource available by next March and available for advisors to start using with students during advising sessions on how to work through the GE system at SJSU.
  - j. Right now the pathways do not have resource monies to track and manage assessment. So they will be designed as tools that can be used for advising.
  - k. The committee has decided to not implement these pathways as certificates since the courses need to be taken regardless of certificate requirements. Certificates would not work as the curriculum is not above and beyond a typical degree, so it was determined they should remain as a tool for advising.
  - l. There is a possible opportunity that might be available through the smart planner project that is gearing up this next week.
  - m. Availability to units that are impacted by 120 units probably won't be feasible.
  - n. The project seems similar to other projects that have been looked at on campus, so ensure they "don't redevelop the wheel."
  - o. Is there going to be an impact to certain GE courses over others (i.e., some courses on the pathway and will be pressured for enrollment and others would try to get on a pathway)?
  - p. Funding is needed in order to make these more robust like the Chico State pathway program; although SJSU would not want to move towards a required pathway model. Cohorts are critical to move these forward in planning appropriate schedules.
  - q. There would still be structure around supporting and guiding students as they move through the pathways. Pathways would only be available to native SJSU students.
  - r. Desirability to link the pathways to the University Learning Goals and SJSU values/commitments.
  - s. Concern over whether the courses in pathway that a student needs to take would time conflict with other courses that are required in their major. Being forced to take certain courses at certain times that won't allow them to take other required coursework.
  - t. How or when would student declare a pathway? Do students even want the pathways, do they see it as a benefit?
  - u. Students would need to know that the pathway is not locked in stone should there need to be adjustments to pathway to accommodate other courses.
  - v. Would we create bottlenecks if we "force" students into specific courses?
  - w. Students would want to know that this "pathway" will take them somewhere at the end. Whether prepare them for all their major requirements or a "certificate of completion in X"
  - x. We can look at implementation issues, from why is it valuable to resource support.
4. S16-4 Clarification on Internships
- a. Additional Language that needs to go into policy based on clarification from Chancellor's Office on CPT (Curricular Practical Training) definitions.

- b. Credit that is required for the degree (for an internship course) would need a University Organization Agreement with agency that the student would work at, IF UNIVERSITY places the student.
- c. CPT whether required for credit or not does not require a UOA with organization, IF UNIVERSITY DOES NOT place student.
- d. Additional Clarification from CO on UOAs and when required for CPT, i.e. around credit towards degree and degree requirement (elective).
- e. We will revise the policy recommendation and clarify the language for definitions.

**Adjourned** 4:02 pm

## **Curriculum & Research**

### **Agenda**

Monday, October 17, 2016

2pm-4pm, SH 331

1. Approval of last meeting minutes (10/3/16).
2. Updates
3. Policy Recommendation: Amendment to S16-14 (Internships)
4. Referral: Department Name Change
5. MS, Bioinformatics  
Time Certain: 3:00pm  
Sami Khuri, Chair, Department of Computer Science  
Miri VanHoven, Associate Professor, Department of Biological Sciences  
Leonard Wesley, Associate Professor, Department of Computer Engineering
6. Minor, Bioinformatics  
Time Certain: 3:20pm  
Sami Khuri, Chair, Department of Computer Science  
Miri VanHoven, Associate Professor, Department of Biological Sciences  
Leonard Wesley, Associate Professor, Department of Computer Engineering
7. Discussion of name change for Department of Hospitality Management
8. Program Planning: Data Elements

**Curriculum & Research**  
**Meeting Minutes**

Monday, October 17, 2016  
2pm-4pm, SH 331

**Present:** Thalia Anagnos, Natalya Balal, Peter Buzanski, Shelley Cargill, Megan Chang, Richard Chung, Beverly Grindstaff, Scott Heil, Ravisha Mathur, Simon Rodan, Pamela Stacks, Lynne Trulio

**Absent:** Toby Matoush

**Guests:** Sami Khuri, Miri VanHoven

**Start:** 2:05 pm

1. Approval of previous minutes (10-03-16)

**\*\*ACTION-** Approved Meeting Minutes as amended from October 3, 2016. **9-Yes, 0-No-0-Abstain**

2. Updates

- a. Smart Technology ORTU passed campus approval process.
- b. Please review the C&R guidelines, and submit any input to the chair. This will be used for the committee in years to come. This has not been vetted by committee and is only available via email.
- c. Should we create a task force to develop different University Learning Goals for the graduate level? Senate executive suggested that this could be an initial task for GS&R. The pros and cons were discussed and it was suggested that we contact GS&R to take on this initiative.

3. S14-6 Update

- a. Clarified what types of internships require UOAs based on credit bearing or not, and whether university has to place the student or not.
- b. When a department provides options to a location it means the university is responsible and must ensure that a UOA is on record.
- c. We still need clarification on responsibility in relation to credit bearing or not.
- d. The office who oversees the UOA and SJS4 process has changed hands. While Center for Community Learning and Leadership is still responsible for management of off-campus activities, the Graduate and Undergraduate Program Office no longer oversees CCLL. The oversight of this policy should be changed to their new unit, Office of Student and Faculty Success.
- e. Thalia will contact the CO for clarification and will get back to the committee. If we can vote we will vote on this policy recommendation by Wednesday.

4. Referral for Changing a name of department.

- a. No policy or office that can clarify what the process is to change a department name and what the proposal should include.
- b. Who (e.g., departments) gets to have a say in approval?

- c. Need to develop a process for reviewing, aligning and approving name changes across campus, with the process fully laid out.
  - d. What are the levels of review?
  - e. Should the policy align with what GUP uses as current process?
5. MS in Bioinformatics
- a. It is a two-year program housed in the Computer Science department.
  - b. The courses already exist. They anticipate students coming in with pre-reqs met; however they will accept conditional applicants who will work on meeting prerequisites.
  - c. How competitive will non-bio/cs students be if they meet the minimum requirements but do not have breadth of students who are bio/cs majors?
    - i. They do not see it as being competitive. They are [or can be] just as successful as a student who has a degree in CS or BIO.
  - d. They plan to offer via stateside to ensure they can offer the courses to meet student need.
  - e. How does this compare or cross fields with biotechnology or biomedical?
    - i. They focus on different aspects of the biological fields.
  - f. Statistics is important and we see there is only one course that is required although there are two total (one in prep for admission). Students will be carefully advised, but there was only so many courses they could add into the masters program.
  - g. They plan to use minor as a pipeline to generate students from both computer science and biology.
  - h. What about industry interest and internships?
    - i. They have been talking with industry professionals. They also are considering an internship option with their culminating experience.
  - i. They should clarify that not all 9 units should come from biology (if bio major), carefully advise students.
  - j. 12 units of undergraduate work instead of 15 units can be used.
  - k. They plan to start with at least 18-20 students and then increase to 40. Currently their intro course only supports 18.
  - l. In regards to python programming requirement, they will take equivalent. They might want to clarify to include other types of acceptable programming language.

**\*\*ACTION-** Approved MS in Bioinformatics, with caveat they make adjustments recommended by committee. **11-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

6. Minor in Bioinformatics
- a. The course descriptions are being updated to reflect “or instructor consent” to assist with getting students into courses. This minor will also be included in any screening of majors.
  - b. The program should consider the grade minimum to be a “C” instead of a “C-”
  - c. Approve with caveat that all prerequisites are removed from or adjusted in the minor.

**\*\*ACTION-** Approved Minor in Bioinformatics, with caveat they make adjustments recommended by committee. **11-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

Adjourned: 3:55pm

## **Curriculum & Research**

### **Agenda**

Monday, November 7, 2016

2pm-4pm, SH 331

1. Approval of last meeting minutes (10/17/16).
2. Updates
3. BA, Mexican American Studies
  - a. Marcos Pizarro, Chair, Mexican American Studies  
Julia Curry, Associate Professor, Mexican American Studies  
Time Certain: 2:10pm
4. Minors in Environmental Studies (3 Minors)
  - a. Lynne Trulio, Chair, Environmental Studies  
Time Certain: 3:00pm
5. Policy Recommendation: Amendment to S16-4 (Internships)
6. Program Planning Data Elements
7. Policy Recommendation: RSCA

**Curriculum & Research**  
**Meeting Minutes**

Monday, November 7, 2016  
2pm-4pm, SH 331

**Present:** Thalia Anagnos, Natalya Balal, Peter Buzanski, Shelley Cargill, Megan Chang, Richard Chung, Beverly Grindstaff, Scott Heil, Ravisha Mathur, Toby Matoush, Simon Rodan, Pamela Stacks, Lynne Trulio

**Guests:** Marcos Pizarro, Julia Curry

**Start:** 2:03 pm

1. Approval of previous minutes (10-17-16)

**\*\*ACTION-** Approved Meeting Minutes as amended from October 17, 2016. **8-Yes, 0-No-1-Abstain**

2. Updates

a. Hospitality Name Change

- i. Name change was originally submitted to Organization and Governance, who forwarded it to C&R with a memo. O&G suggested that C&R not approve the name change for several reasons.
- ii. Originally Recreation Management sent a letter of support, but then rescinded it.
- iii. C&R Chair will meet with the various groups to clear up the confusion.
- iv. We could move forward since technically as it was signed off by the college.
- v. Next week's materials are in the folder already.

3. BA, Mexican American Studies

- a. This BA would be serving a specific population of students and they have created various areas of expertise that are part of elective requirements and hope to turn them into specializations.
- b. The Department has seen lots of interest from around campus and done some great assessment with their minor student population.
- c. MAS worked with GUP and UGS to update and clean up curriculum and proposal materials.
- d. Recommendation that they create a core of 50% which means they would need at least one more course listed at core. The committee suggested moving MAS 135 since it is listed in each area of elective specializations.
- e. Sociology courses are similar, but the department wanted to stick with focus on Mexican American studies.
- f. There will be heavy advising for the first few years of the program to ensure students get into areas of interest.

- g. They set up the elective area to have a general course list and then leave variants under areas. There seems to be courses that fit across each of the specialty areas.
- h. They will have to help students market their skillset from the degree. There is a market, but the department will be advising them into specific areas to make themselves more marketable based on their focus area.
- i. A course that student learning outcomes is based on does not appear to be in core. So how will that be assessed for a student who does not take the course?
- j. They are currently doing some revising to their courses for capstone and internship course. Changing MAS125 to MAS190.
- k. Question: There may be an unintended impact on your minor with students going to BA instead of minor. Are you concerned over it?
  - i. Not really, there are still a lot of students who take the GE courses which basically sets them up to finish minor.
- l. Question: Other CSU's do offer similar degrees, but are offered in different communities. So what will be difference between SFSU and SJSU offerings in this discipline?
  - i. SJSU is more Mexican, SFSU is more salvadoran/central american
  - ii. The fact that the focus is on Mexican American particularly is a good point to use in justification so that it stands out from other similar programs.
- m. They want to accommodate and address undocumented students/population.
- n. Suggest we approve based on the fact that they clarify a few points (outlined in our discussion) prior to final approval by committee.
- o. **\*\*MOTION-** Inform department proposal was well received, a few adjustments are recommended before final committee approval **13-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

#### 4. Environmental Studies Minors

- a. BA students are unable to take the BS in Environmental Studies concentrations, so these minors would allow for the department to offer areas of study without the concentration restrictions.
- b. This will also allow department to streamline their degrees for a BA or BS in Environmental Studies. Students will then take a required minor; this could be one of the new minors or an advisor approved minor.
- c. They do overall assessment of BA and BS, not concentrations.
- d. They have a capstone course in each of the minors so they can start doing assessment of minors.
- e. Advisor approved lists need to go to GUP for distribution to evaluators/audit.
- f. Units are slightly off, GUP will work to clarify.

**\*\*ACTION-** Approved three Minors in Environmental Studies. **12-Yes, 0-No, 1-Abstain**

#### 5. S16-4 Internship Policy

- a. Thalia will be having a follow up conversation with Chancellor's office and SJSU Campus Finance to ensure they are all hearing the same message before we rework policy

## 6. Program Planning Data Elements

- a. Remove the trends and program FTEs reduction from course load matrix.
- b. Should every department report on all the Required Data Elements?
- c. How are they looking at the data and using it to develop their majors?
- d. How many students do you need to intake to ensure you can offer the capstone courses at exit?
- e. What kind of freshman transfer enrollment do you need to have a sustainable program?
- f. Will share Data Elements table so that committee can make comments on data elements and whether they are helpful to tell a story for the department.
- g. Maybe departments should organize the elements based on what story they may want to tell.
- h. GUP should provide short summaries of what the information describes.
- i. For our next meeting, we should identify what elements are necessary and what are optional.

Adjourned: 4:00pm

## **Curriculum & Research**

### **Agenda**

Monday, November 14, 2016

2pm-4pm, SH 331

1. Approval of last meeting minutes (11/7/16)

2. Updates

#### Curriculum

3. Minor, Applied Computing for Behavioral and Social Sciences

a. Time Certain 2:05pm: Morris Jones, Electrical Engineering

#### Policy

4. Policy Recommendation: RSCA

5. Program Planning, Data Elements

**Curriculum & Research**  
**Meeting Minutes**

Monday, November 14, 2016  
2pm-4pm, SH 331

**Present:** Thalia Anagnos, Natalya Balal, Peter Buzanski, Shelley Cargill, Megan Chang, Richard Chung, Beverly Grindstaff, Scott Heil, Ravisha Mathur, Toby Matoush, Simon Rodan, Pamela Stacks, Lynne Trulio

**Guests:** Morris Jones (Electrical Engineering)

**Start:** 2:03 pm

1. Approval of previous minutes (11-7-16)

**\*\*ACTION-** Approved Meeting Minutes from November 7, 2016. **7-Yes, 0-No, 1-Abstain**

2. Updates

- a. With the national election, faculty, students, and staff are experiencing turmoil and unsafe feelings. The executive committee has created a Sense of the Senate Resolution on ensuring that we maintain our campus as inclusive and safe supportive environment. This resolution will be voted on at the next senate meeting on Monday.
- b. It will go to entire faculty to vote for endorsement. It will also be sent to various constituencies (e.g., students, staff) for their support.
- c. In the executive committee, there were concerns raised about how faculty can provide support to students. The Provost will coordinate with Amy Strage and Stacy Gleixner to develop training for faculty to help struggling students.

3. Minor, Applied Computing for Behavioral and Social Sciences

- a. The minor was initiated in conversation with Psychology department. The minor is multi-disciplinary.
- b. They focus on Python and R as they are the current industry standard for programming (R and Python are the most popular languages in job postings).
- c. The minor has support from two Deans and two corporations.
- d. In terms of recruiting, it will be publicized by psych and econ faculty; students will be also recruited through advising.
- e. For all upper division courses - there are prerequisites (basic stats or linear math) that all students in these programs should have (or instructor consent).
- f. The first course was initially offered this fall. 30 students showed up, 20 stayed (some are graduate students).
- g. This minor might develop a separate sequence for grad students.
- h. Why not any B4 course as a prereq? Program doesn't want to have a large pre-requisite set or students will be scared away.
- i. Will this make students more employable? Original intent was training academic researchers.

- j. Working with two other universities and industry partners (e.g., collaboration with CSU East Bay).
- k. Is this sustainable? Getting the word out and advising is key. Sustainability looks like a problem - low numbers and part time faculty teaching the courses.
- l. A minor that takes a long time to complete is problematic. CS 120 will be offered every semester to speed up progress.
- m. This is a minor with no optional classes.
- n. How long will each of these languages (R, Python) be relevant - 15-20 years.
- o. If there is market demand for these skills the program will flourish. The NSF grant suggests that they have convinced others of the value of this minor.
- p. Move to approve -
  - i. Move to amend - "with minor modification" - approved (12,0,0)
  - ii. Move to approve, the main motion approved (12,0,0)

**\*\*ACTION-** Approved new minor with minor modification **12-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

#### 4. Curriculum Updates

- a. There is some curriculum still to come to GUP even though catalog deadlines have passed. Urgency and prompting required within the colleges.
- b. Executive committee sees the need for a university curriculum policy, especially to ensure that faculty retain control over the curriculum. Needed to deal with administrative over-reach. Also to clarify curricular processes (e.g., Should lecturers vote? This might be delegated to colleges).
- c. Potential conflict of interest when adjunct faculty without 'tenure' might influence curriculum to keep their positions. This is one of the most important issues and one that administrators pay most attention to.
- d. The policy should acknowledge that adjunct faculty play a vital role on the campus. However, when we ask adjunct faculty to serve this is beyond their contract. They contractually can't volunteer their time. Some campuses have 1.0 lecturers of which 0.8 is teaching as with TTF faculty. TTF faculty are hired for more than just their teaching.
- e. This policy will be a multi-year project.
- f. The budget is the major determinant of curriculum - more money allows for greater variety. However, the intent of the policy is to set out the process for development and approval of curriculum, not the content.
- g. The idea of this policy has been around for 20 years; the can has been kicked down the road for workload. Few other CSU campuses appear to have a curriculum policy. Some campuses have all curricular matters flow through to the Senate. Some CSU campuses have a faculty Senate as a subset of the academic Senate to deal with curriculum.
- h. Different departments have very different approaches to curricular change; some want adjuncts to take part, others strongly opposed. The policy must ultimately be quite flexible. The key objective is that faculty maintain control of curriculum.
- i. A one-size fits all won't work, at least when it comes to voting rights. ADs need some guidance on curricular approval processes.

- j. One route is to use current policy as modules of a larger overarching policy; each is removed as the single coherent single policy is developed?
2. RSCA policy
- a. New name proposed: “Conduct of Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity: Sponsored Projects and Research Guidelines”
  - b. The policy is intended to cover all research, not just sponsored research. There are issues for Humanities in dealing with co-authoring.
  - c. The conflict of interest section should also reference the University conflict of interest policy.
  - d. “Faculty must never prioritize their or third party interests over those of the students’ involved in the project” is problematic as there are situations where this may not be possible.
  - e. For students going to a course with students from other institutions to talk about their ideas, could their IP rights be protected? In a lecture, could a faculty member allow the use of a company’s live data? Students are not employees and the university cannot mandate non-disclosure.
  - f. General Counsel has said that the University cannot endorse or facilitate an NDA. But students may voluntarily enter into an NDA with third parties. This will need to be discussed.

Adjourned 4:03pm

# **Curriculum & Research**

## **Agenda**

Monday, November 28, 2016

2pm-4pm, SH 331

1. Approval of last meeting minutes (11/14/16)

2. Updates

### Curriculum

3. Department Name Change: Hospitality Management to Hospitality, Tourism, and Event Management

Time Certain: 2:05pm, Tsu-Hong Yen, Chair, Department of Hospitality Management

4. Revised Proposal: BA, Mexican American Studies

### Policy

5. Policy Recommendation: Amendment to S16-14: Clarification of Internships

6. Policy Recommendation: RSCA

**Curriculum & Research**  
**Meeting Minutes**

Monday, November 28, 2016  
2pm-4pm, SH 331

**Present:** Thalia Anagnos, Natalya Balal, Shelley Cargill, Richard Chung, Scott Heil, Ravisha Mathur, Toby Matoush, Simon Rodan, Pamela Stacks, Lynne Trulio

**Absent:** Peter Buzanski, Megan Chang, Beverly Grindstaff

**Guests:** Tsu-Hong Yen (HSPM), HSPM Faculty

**Start:** 2:05 pm

1. Approval of previous minutes (11-14-16)

**\*\*ACTION-** Approved Meeting Minutes from November 14, 2016. **6-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

2. HSPM Name Change

- a. There are major changes in the field and in their curriculum that are driving the name change.
- b. A name change proposal was submitted in the past, but faculty were encouraged to wait as there was 'significant' paperwork involved.
- c. The focus of their curriculum has been on business side of hospitality management and their curriculum supports this change.
- d. Faculty are interested in training students to meet industry needs in hospitality and event/conference/meeting management.
- e. Curriculum currently aligns with EMBOK (Event Management Body of Knowledge), which is a business oriented definition of processes by which an event is planned, prepared, and produced. This approach also focuses on assessment, definition, acquisition, allocation, direction, control and analysis of time, finances, people, products, services, and other resources to achieve objectives.
- f. This name change is the department attempting to align with what is occurring in the industry in which they train their students.
- g. What is the difference between the hospitality "event" management program and the Recreation "event" management program?
  - i. Their focus is on park and recreation or city sponsored events and management. The HSPM Students are focused on more large scale corporate events and an industry that has a larger growth area in business than recreation which focuses on community involvement.
  - ii. There is also a difference in private and public sector between these two event management programs. The policies, processes and management styles in each of these areas differs and the right training creates successful students, this program gears the learning towards being able to work in large aspects (coordination, etc) of event management.

- iii. As far as similar courses in titles, HSPM would focus on the larger event aspects as opposed to recreation who would focus more on parks, local city events; how legal aspects come into play will vary between a private corporation and a state agency. However, the courses offered in each department support the other.
- iv. Will course titles be changed/updated to ensure students take the right course between HSPM and REC? Yes, they will move forward with other curricular changes once the department name change is approved.
- h. How will this affect students, faculty recruitment, etc?
  - i. On average 2-3 students were unsure of what hospitality management is (at advising or major events), this will help clarify what they do for these types of students
  - ii. For industry, it will be clear for students and internship sites to identify exactly what the program is training their students to do.
- i. They have 'married' and 'divorced' from Recreation a few times over the years and thus the department has changed names every 3 years. What does this mean in terms of transparency and stability for students?
- j. One committee member asked why this name change should be considered given that, only three years ago, they and Recreation agreed NOT to include either tourism or event planning in their name. Doesn't this name change request violate the agreement set out only a short time ago, especially since Recreation is not in favor of allowing Hospitality Management to include tourism and event planning in their name?
- k. One concern from Recreation is that they are in the midst of revamping their program and this name change could directly affect the direction they are looking to move in.
- l. They waited to change name due to various changes happening in the college and now that they are ready to go; however, departments in the college are not in agreement with name, they are behind the times with industry changes.
- m. They have developed interdisciplinary relationships with other departments to offer courses that meet both of their needs in the skill areas.
- n. Has the department considered creating an ORTU? This might address the needed changes and also allow for more collaboration across faculty.
- o. Committee should hold off until program planning makes a decision.
  - i. A previous program planning cycle revealed that the faculty in Hospitality were not very strong with professional guidance and scholarship. Has this improved?
  - ii. When the split with Recreation happened, some recreation faculty stayed with hospitality.
  - iii. Recreation has had permission to do some hires to strengthen and bolster their full-time faculty; this may strengthen their capacities to offer more of their courses.

- p. The college seems to be inconsistent with its support. The College acknowledged that it was not taken to full college for vote before sending it forward.
  - q. Opportunity to send message that this is not the way to fight the internal college battles.
  - r. Motion: Send it back to the college and gather additional information, have a College Curriculum Committee vote prior to leaving the college.  
Instructions: Departments need to consult together, consider the development of the two affected departments in the last three years (i.e., tourism, event management), should consider program planning that both programs have just gone through in joint consultation, speak to why department name change is critical vs. degree name change (evidence for department name change)
- \*\*ACTION-** Approve the motion to send request back for review by college to gather more details and discussion around future of programs. **10-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

3. BA, MAS proposal

- a. They have re-submitted materials, this will be first part of our review at next meeting. Please submit any questions online prior to next week.

4. Internship policy amendment

- a. The conversation with Josee and CO risk management came to the same conclusion Thalia presented at last meeting. Thus these changes are implemented within the policy recommendation.
- b. Committee quickly reviewed the policy recommendation and made some adjustments.
- c. We will send this policy recommendation to Josee, Valerie, and Zachary (at the Chancellor's Office).

5. Extending meeting by an hour next week.

- \*\*ACTION-** Approve extending December 5th meeting an extra hour (2-5pm). **10-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain**

Adjourned 4:12pm

# **Curriculum & Research**

## **Agenda**

Monday, December 5, 2016

2pm-5pm [*Note: Extended Time*], SH 331

1. Approval of last meeting minutes (11/28/16)

2. Updates

### Curriculum

3. Review of revised BA, Mexican American Studies

4. Unit Change Proposals

Time Certain: 2:15pm

a. Damian Bacich, Chair, World Languages & Literature

i. Proposal

b. Shannon Miller, Chair, English & Comparative Literature

Noelle-Brada Williams, Associate Chair, English & Comparative Literature

i. Proposal

### Policy

5. Policy Recommendation: Amendment to S16-14: Clarification of Internship

6. Policy Recommendation: RSCA

7. Discussion of Revised Data Elements

## Curriculum & Research

### Meeting Minutes

Monday, December 5, 2016

2pm-5pm (*Extended Meeting*)

**Present:** Thalia Anagnos, Natalya Balal, Shelley Cargill, Richard Chung, Scott Heil, Ravisha Mathur, Toby Matoush, Simon Rodan, Pamela Stacks, Lynne Trulio, Peter Buzanski, Megan Chang, Beverly Grindstaff

**Guests:** Shannon Miller, Damian Bacich, Kathleen McSharry, Noelle Brada-Williams, Cheyla Samuelson

1. Approval of last meeting minutes (11/28/16)

**\*\*ACTION-** Approved Meeting Minutes as amended from November 28, 2016. **9-Yes, 0- No, 3- Abstain**

2. Updates

Noted approvals in curriculum from the Provost's office.

Updates about changes in "core" across concentrations from Chancellor's office (should have more information in our next meeting).

Discussion of some SJSU initiatives (Food Pantry, UnDocuAllies)

### Curriculum

3. Review of revised BA, Mexican American Studies

- a. Discussed revisions made by the program and highlighted key additions.

- b. Confusion about MAS 101 missing from the transfer roadmap

**\*\*ACTION-** Recommended approval of BA, MAS pending minor clarification of MAS 101.

**11-Yes, 0-No, 1- Abstain**

4. Unit Change Proposals

- a. Both departments chairs and faculty from English & Comparative Literature and World Languages & Literature discussed their respective unit change proposals.

- b. Discussion of 50% core for programs.

- c. Discussion of 3 unit standard requested by Chancellor's Office.

- d. Discussion of impact on articulation and SB 1440.

- e. Include individual assignment statement on syllabi to represent the 4th unit.

- f. Spanish 170 revised syllabus has a good explanation of the assignment.

- g. Courses have the chance to be very different.

- h. How do the programs keep the courses from drifting from the Carnegie unit definition? Could a review happen in program planning?

- i. Are any courses cross-listed? (Answer -ENGL 126)

- j. Should there be a policy about 4 unit courses? This would be difficult because each course is different.

- k. Need to also focus on faculty. These unit changes could affect hiring because of each faculty teaching fewer units.
- l. Discussion of faculty-student engagement.
- m. Classroom management vs. content teaching. Having 4 units makes for fewer discrete preparations.
- n. What percent of grading should be on the final? Or on the product of the extra units?
- o. Put instructor role in the syllabus for the extra unit.
- p. What is a logical amount for a student to do for 3 units or for 4 units?
- q. How many students should be in each course?
- r. World Languages will have more consistency in their curriculum.
- s. GUP could have a guideline for adding a unit course, statement on workload for students.
- t. Items that C&R would like in these proposals: Within the syllabi there should be some discussion of how the extra unit is linked to faculty and student workload (should be identifying additional work link to the unit). Prior to offering a course, provide some specificity as to how a course is engaging the student in the HIP.

#### Policy

##### 5. Policy Recommendation: Amendment to S16-14: Clarification of Internship

- a. Discussed some of the additional information gathered from Josee and from the Chancellor's Office

**\*\*ACTION-** Recommended moving policy recommendation to the senate for the first reading  
**11-Yes, 0-No, 0- Abstain**

##### 6. Policy Recommendation: RSCA

- a. Some discussion of organization of the policy
- b. Should there be whereas/resolved statements?

Adjourned at 5:01 PM

# **Curriculum & Research**

## **Agenda**

Monday, January 30, 2017

2pm-4pm, SH 331

1. Approval of last meeting minutes (12/5/17)
2. Updates

### Curriculum

3. Review of Department Name Change: Department of Television, Radio, Film, and Theatre
  - a. Proposal Folder: Department of Film and Theatre
  - b. Time Certain, 2:00 pm, Scott Sublett, Department Chair
4. Review of Degree Name Change, Department of Health Science & Recreation
  - a. Proposal Folder: Health Science to Public Health
5. Degree Discontinuations
  - a. BA, Creative Arts, Teacher Preparation: Proposal Folder
  - b. MA, Theatre Arts: Proposal Folder

### Policy

6. Policy Recommendation: Amendment to S16-14: Clarification of Internship
7. Policy Recommendation: RSCA
8. Policy Recommendation: Program Planning
  - a. Discussion of Required Data Elements
  - b. Discussion of Program Planning Guidelines

## Curriculum & Research

### Meeting Minutes

Monday, January 30, 2017

2pm-4pm

**Present:** Thalia Anagnos, Shelley Cargill, Richard Chung, Scott Heil, Eric Medrano, Ravisha Mathur, Simon Rodan, Lynne Trulio, Peter Buzanski, Megan Chang, Beverly Grindstaff

**Absent:** Toby Matoush, Pamela Stacks,

**Guests:** Scott Sublett (TRFT Chair)

#### 1. Department Name Change

- a. Discussed the Television, Radio, Theater and Film name change to Film and Theatre.
- b. No one really knows the name (not even their dean can get it right).
- c. Over the years the department has merged and split with various departments, eventually merging film, television and theatre.
- d. After numerous discussions, the department agreed to Film and Theatre.
- e. Radio is now more music focused and journalism isn't preparing for radio news.
- f. Television, they will still keep the studio, but journalism has kept most of the television (news) focus. Film is mostly digital now, so the focus of television and film is mostly similar (in terms of production and skills)
- g. How will this change affect how students find the RTVF degree? Students have always found the degree whether they know it is held under RTVF or not. With the previous department name they still found the degree (when it was just Theatre Arts).
- h. Graduates are developed to be more hands on than scholarly.
- i. One of the few schools that does feature length films
- j. Currently searching for a sound designer faculty member for hands on production.
- k. Seeking a PhD. to assist in growing and building on film history.
- l. Very few theater arts majors, struggling to keep them on the books. They are generally more focused on acting than historical, scholarly or production level interest.
- m. MA in Theatre has been on admission suspension for over 3 years.
- n. After retirements over the last few years (since program has been on suspension) no longer have as many theater PhDs. So the program is not sustainable and want to use resources towards BA, Theatre Arts.
- o. Is there a possible collaboration regarding radio and journalism? RTVF does not do news or make documentaries, they are seen as journalistic functions.
- p. Looking at GE class on comedy and possibly satire. Satire is a hard beast because it generally comes off best when done with the times (i.e. today's satire topics have to be done that day to be funny).

**\*\*ACTION-** Approve name change from RTVF to Film and Theatre. **10-Yes, 0- No, 0- Abstain**

**\*\*ACTION-** Approve Discontinuation of MA in Theatre Arts. **10-Yes, 0- No, 0- Abstain**

2. Approval of last meeting minutes (12/5/16)

- a. Has anything been done about identifying what the faculty member will be doing for the extra unit? (in relation to the English and World Language unit increase).
- b. Departments have been asked to submit an updated syllabus with the faculty and student workload being outlined for what is expected.

**\*\*ACTION-** Approved Meeting Minutes as amended from December 5, 2016. **9-Yes, 0- No, 1- Abstain**

3. Updates

- a. EO 1071 regarding concentrations was revised on January 20th, we will need to abide by the CO policy as well as the SJSU policy. There is no grandfathering in under this revised policy, this would require programs to be at least 50% core in common. Programs should start reviewing and updating during their program review cycles (as suggested by the EO).
- b. ORU for the Institute on Sport and Social Change will be coming through C&R, it was promoted and had an inaugural event. It was noted they have not gone through official process, and so they will begin working through that (Cami Johnson will be doing the ORU).
- c. Research Commons- SJSU will be developing one based on student and faculty needs. Surveys and focus groups will begin regarding what this commons would look like on campus and where they will be.

4. Degree Name Change

- a. From BS in Health Science to a BS in Public Health
- b. Will there be a subject prefix change? Not that we know of, but GUP would highly discourage it.

**\*\*ACTION-** Approve BS Health Science to BS Public Health. **10-Yes, 0- No, 0- Abstain**

5. Discontinuation of Creative Studies, Preparation for Teaching

- a. This program would wrap themselves under the Liberal Arts, Teacher Preparation program.
- b. Just the teacher prep concentration, the base degree would stay as is.
- c. Will this have an affect on any other teacher prep programs?
- d. Note that they will need to ensure they abide by the 50% concentration alignment. GUP will check this.

**\*\*ACTION-** Approve discontinuation of the BA Creative Arts Preparation for Teaching. **10-Yes, 0- No, 0- Abstain**

6. Policy-

- a. Internships

- i. Is there a standard course number for internships? No, not even titles. However, GUP is working on adding attribute tags (behind the scenes) that would allow campus to track which courses are internships.
  - ii. College of Business still has concerns over required UOAs. Large businesses are still hesitant to sign.
  - iii. To ensure that Business has had a chance to review the policy, we will wait one more week to vote on this second reading.
- b. RSCA- Pam would like to see this move forward soon. Committee wants to wait until Pam is in the meeting to review this policy. Please be sure to check for grammar, spelling errors as well as content.
- c. Program Planning
  - i. Required Data Elements
    1. There will be some data elements that will not be required because they are only useful to some departments and not all.
    2. There are goals given to us by CO, so the recommendation is to include data that can assist with discussions on these goals.
    3. Look at top "D-F-W" (grade) courses in which students tend to get those grades
    4. Outline what data is considered the University "Official" data.
    5. Alumni feedback should be included to maybe assist department in figuring out where they might have to make changes pedagogically. However, some programs have a robust system for tracking and others do not. What questions would we want to ask, and what would qualify as a good response rate?

Adjourned at 4:01 PM

## **Curriculum & Research**

### **Agenda**

Monday, February 6, 2017

2pm-4pm, SH 331

1. Approval of last meeting minutes (1/30/17).
2. Policy Recommendation: Amendment to S16-14: Clarification of Internship
3. Policy Recommendation: RSCA
4. Policy Recommendation: Program Planning
  - a. Discussion of Policy
  - b. Discussion of Guidelines
  - c. Discussion of Data Elements

## Curriculum & Research

### Meeting Minutes

Monday, February 6, 2017

2pm-4pm

**Present:** Thalia Anagnos, Peter Buzanski, Megan Chang, Shelley Cargill, Richard Chung, Beverly Grindstaff, Scott Heil, Eric Medrano, Ravisha Mathur, Simon Rodan, Lynne Trulio, Pamela Stacks

**Absent:** Toby Matoush

1. Approval of last meeting minutes (1/30/2017)

**\*\*ACTION-** Approved Meeting Minutes as amended from January 30, 2017. **6-Yes, 0- No, 2- Abstain**

2. Internship Policy

- a. Clarified resolve regarding process for negotiation of modifications to UOAs by organization and by SJSU unit. UOAs can be negotiated and modified with consultation and approval of Administration and Finance.
- b. Clarified resolve on internship being required. Concern is around 'guaranteeing' placement of student at an organization for the department vetted option.
- c. Issues revolve around how many agency placements should a department have to say they are doing their due diligence and is it clear on what students options are if a placement is not available.
- d. Instead of course substitution, use 'alternative experience.' For example, an independent study.

**\*\*ACTION-** Approved Meeting Minutes as amended from January 30, 2017. **12-Yes, 0- No, 0- Abstain**

3. RSCA

- a. Review of research guidelines, which includes policy and conduct.
- b. Clarified classified and proprietary research section, is there a need for classified as there is already a policy covering it?
- c. Principal investigator might not be appropriate for Creative activities.
- d. RSCA advising role with student relationship, use advisor instead of faculty (i.e., RSCA advisor).
- e. How do we define significant (in terms of significant contribution)?
- f. Reworked the alignment section in the policy.
- g. Adjusted financial support section to clarify where the financial funds are coming from and how it relates to the student sponsorship. Where funds come from should be known. Should we use supports instead of upholds?
- h. Sponsored Research- some notations around contribution. To what degree are contributions noted in research? Ex. some students may just do administrative work which may not be considered a substantial contribution to overall research.

- i. Committee decided to set up a RSCA subcommittee to review the policy. We will then send out the policy for committee review. And then onto other campus constituencies.

Meeting adjourned 4:00pm

# **Curriculum & Research**

## **Agenda**

Monday, February 20, 2017

2pm-4pm, SH 331

1. Approval of last meeting minutes (2/6/17).
2. Updates
  - a. Questions about core concentration units
  - b. C- in the basic four (within policies)
3. ORTU Proposal: Institute for People and Performance Analytics
4. Policy Recommendation: Internship
5. Policy Recommendation: RSCA
6. Policy Recommendation: Program Planning
  - a. Discussion of Policy
  - b. Discussion of Guidelines
  - c. Discussion of Data Elements

## Curriculum & Research

### Meeting Minutes

Monday, February 20, 2017

2pm-4pm (extended until 5pm by vote)

**Present:** Thalia Anagnos, Peter Buzanski, Megan Chang, Shelley Cargill, Richard Chung, Beverly Grindstaff, Scott Heil, Eric Medrano, Toby Matoush, Ravisha Mathur, Simon Rodan, Lynne Trulio

**Absent:** Pamela Stacks

**Guest:** Gilles Muller (Associate Dean, Office of Research)

1. Approve today's meeting going to 5pm (optional request).
2. Approve Meeting Minutes from February 6, 2017

**\*\*ACTION-** Approved Meeting Minutes from February 6, 2017. **9-Yes, 0- No,**

**1- Abstain**

#### 3. Updates

- a. EO coded memorandum came down from CO that units across concentrations, options, emphases should now have 50% units in common (core).
  - i. Is this going to require us to update our current policy to align and then define what the "in common" means?
4. Last senate had discussion about C- in the golden four GE areas. SJSU may want a higher standard.
5. WST, 100W and GVAR as they are required for graduate level.
  - a. Discussions in the Writing Requirements Committee as to using the WST as a prerequisite for graduate level students.
  - b. On-going discussions about what is appropriate as a prerequisite for graduate students taking a GVAR.
  - c. Some issues are around whether 100W should even be considered an acceptable course for graduate level GVAR. If graduate students want to take 100W should they be held to the WST prerequisite.
6. ORTU- Institute for People and Performance Analytics
  - a. The title seems unrelated to what they are doing within this ORTU.
  - b. This ORTU is more training focused than research focused (which we have typically been encountering).
  - c. Courses or curricular development are not supposed to be used within ORTUs. Not sure if this includes courses that already exist.
  - d. ORTU's have to show they are viable and self-sustaining by year three in order to continue. Office of Research oversees this process of ORTU review.
  - e. Confusion over whether there is a vice director or assistant director, as it appears it was taken away in title but not in funding/release time. It does however show up in Year 2 and 3 that an assistant director (or vice director). Inconsistent, will ask the department to fix to match across sections of the proposal.

- f. C&R requests additional revisions prior to recommending approval.
7. Internship
- a. An amendment was made on the floor by senate member Bethany Shifflett. She recommended that the policy include a line about staffing issues and UOA renewal.
  - b. The amendment should list that there are workload issues and that resources for staff are needed for maintaining S4 database, as well as process and review of UOAs and train and support users. The Provost had some concerns about allocation of resources within Academic Affairs.
  - c. The managing department (Student and Faculty Success) will continue to manage oversight of UOAs. Departments will be notified if a UOA needs to be renewed and will be up to them to negotiate renewal.
  - d. Will vote after this has been vetted by Provost and VP for Student and Faculty Success.
8. Policy- RSCA
- a. Concerns around verbiage of financial support for students, what is the assistance? Is this clear enough? What happens if they choose not to take financial assistance?
  - b. Beverly has additional edits she will send to Ravisha.
  - c. Reworked verbiage under principal investigator
  - d. Title reverted back to the original title, lengthy, but encompasses all that is entailed in the policy.
  - e. Ravisha will clean up formatting issues (random bullet sizes), asks that members gather feedback on the policy draft.
9. Policy- Program Planning
- a. Key changes, added in a requirement to discuss opportunities in their program, added a designee for staff support of GUP as a non-voting member.
  - b. The O&G committee had a few suggestions on policy update.
  - c. PPC will implement the guidelines.
  - d. We added the goal of activities and allows the department to determine what those mean (i.e. RSCA, Curricular activities, etc).
  - e. What or when does the new review cycle start, especially around the new seven year period instead of five. When the new date is implemented should be written into guidelines/policy.
  - f. Mid-year reports for accredited programs would be four years for programs with eight-or-more year accreditation cycles
  - g. Clarified where the assessment reports are developed.
  - h. GE is missing from the policy. While there is reference there is no substantial information about how it is part of the overall plan.
  - i. There is no information (in section 6.A) that discusses how the Board of General Studies is involved in the overall program review cycle.

Meeting adjourned 5:00pm.

# **Curriculum & Research**

## **Agenda**

Monday, March 6, 2017

2pm-4pm, SH 331

1. Approval of last meeting minutes (2/20/17)
2. Updates: Review of Referrals

### Curriculum

3. Department Name Change: HSPM
4. ORTU: Institute for People and Performance
5. Discontinuation of ORTU: Biodiversity Center

### Policy

6. Internship: Final Reading draft
7. RSCA review: Feedback and First Reading
8. Program Planning: Policy, Guidelines, and Data Elements
9. Policy on Department Name Changes
  - a. Policy Draft
10. Policy Amendment for S14-9: Core Units in Concentrations, Options, and Emphases
  - a. Folder with EO, coded memo, and S14-9
11. Policy on Blended 3+2 or 4+1 programs: Information Folder

## Curriculum & Research

### Meeting Minutes

Monday, March 6, 2017

2pm-4pm

**Present:** Thalia Anagnos, Peter Buzanski, Megan Chang, Shelley Cargill, Richard Chung, Beverly Grindstaff, Eric Medrano, Toby Matoush, Ravisha Mathur, Simon Rodan, Pamela Stacks, Lynne Trulio

**Absent:** Scott Heil

1. Approve Meeting Minutes from February 20, 2017  
**\*\*ACTION-** Approved Meeting Minutes from February 22, 2017. **7-Yes, 0- No, 0- Abstain**
2. Updates
  - a. Message from Peter Buzanski- After years of involvement in various areas of senate committees, the amount of work for committees is extraordinary. There is an overburden of policy and reviews and this is a discussion and concern that should be addressed by the senate executive committee.
  - b. Reviewed referrals in our calendar
    - i. RSCA policy- some review today
    - ii. Internship will hopefully be on senate floor on Monday
  - c. Executive Committee was reviewing the possibility of a new position for VP of Research and Innovation.
    - i. What is the value added?
    - ii. Isn't there enough high level administration on campus?
    - iii. This type of position would create frustration by departments who bring in extensive funding to have it realigned to other operations instead of the project that brought in the funding.
  - d. Referral for WST for graduate students. Writing Requirements Committee (WRC) would like to remove the prerequisite of WST for 100W for graduate students only.
    - i. This may not need a new or updated policy, but we could take care of this via implementation.
    - ii. Reviewed this with executive committee.
    - iii. S95-5 and S94-7 outline the requirements for GVAR/100W and what the competency requirement is, and does not outline that there is a prerequisite for graduates. The current policies allow us to make this adjustment with procedure.
    - iv. There is an issue with timing and availability of WST for graduates. This could create bottlenecks for students. The WST also has no clear predictive value for success in 100W.

- v. Recommendation is to not require WST as a prerequisite for 100W for graduate level students.
- vi. Executive Committee would like to have this in place by Fall 2017, AVP for Graduate and Undergraduate Programs states they can definitely target Spring 2017.
- vii. Committee agrees to send referral back to Academic senate with the recommendation that this prerequisite be removed per policies allowing for exception.

### 3. Hospitality Management Name Change

- a. The Dean has sent a memo back approving the name change. She is in full support and has met with the departments.
- b. There was no college vote, but the dean did meet with the departments and had a discussion with Recreation and Health Science.
- c. The council of chairs for the college had discussed this issue
- d. Concerns over there not being a vote or memo from Recreation department in support of name change.
- e. Health Science and Recreation program planning discussed a focus around recreation as a means to wellness, not event management.
- f. What is consensus? Would we vote no, just because there is a lack of support from one department?
- g. The dean feels they did their due diligence and approved as a college.
- h. We will express the issues with name changes in the memo to the Provost for this name change.

**\*\*ACTION-** Approve name change from Hospitality Management to Hospitality, Tourism and Event Management. **8-Yes, 1- No, 3- Abstain**

### 4. ORTU- People and Performance

- a. Clarified co-chair and vice chair.
- b. Adjusted name to contain what they really plan to offer.

**\*\*ACTION-** Approve ORTU People and Performance. **12-Yes, 0- No, 0- Abstain**

### 5. ORTU Biodiversity Center Discontinuation

- a. They have a balance in their account, what will happen with that? The foundation office will keep money aside for that specific faculty member to continue to do their research.
- b. Money will continue to be spent as per the distribution from agency.
- c. Originally established as an informal group that then used center for grant raising opportunities and now they lack faculty to continue sustaining the center.

**\*\*ACTION-** Approve discontinuation of Biodiversity Center ORTU. **12-Yes, 0- No, 0- Abstain**

### 6. Internship Policy

- a. Use the statement that staff resources are needed. Where and how the Provost chooses to provide them will be up to him.
- b. Provost needs to be aware that additional resources will be needed for the office that manages this database.
- c. Chair will meet with Provost prior to the senate meeting.

**\*\*ACTION-** Approve moving Internship policy to senate. **12-Yes, 0- No, 0- Abstain**

#### 7. RSCA Policy

- a. Feedback from discussion Gilles and Chair had with department constituents.
- b. Clarified language about when there is same entity involved in RSCA activities.
- c. Conflict of interest declaration is only mentioned in one area, and if this is an issue or concern then it should be outlined further in the policy, either earlier or express what needs to be done.
  - i. Campus conflict of interest policy is out of date, and it is noted that this policy will need to be updated along with others as this policy comes under review.
- d. There is still feedback coming in from others in the campus community. Let's highlight areas of concern, so we can address each as we do a full update.
- e. Conflict of interest could be listed towards end of the policy, near the nondisclosure area, that way if needed it can be pulled out.
- f. Table discussion until next meeting.

#### 8. Program Planning Policy and Guidelines

- a. For the most part we have finished the policy.
- b. Guidelines need work before we start going out and discuss with departments.
- c. Should we have a subcommittee look at all suggestions before presenting to full committee? Not a good use of committee time to review all guidelines in C&R meeting (23 pages).
- d. GE Assessment component fits into program planning, and how it should connect with the process.
  - i. In general GE assessment packages should be submitted with program planning report as an appendix.
  - ii. Issue is that some assessments come in, some don't and some are submitted in partial ways.
  - iii. PPC seems to not follow up with what parts are missing from GE and that has been issue for BOGS to complete review in time for Action Plan meeting.
- e. The GE portion could be built in as part of the plan template in hopes to get a better response/submission.
- f. Create a tracking system to monitor both pieces of the program planning process (GE and general PP process).
- g. Suggest adding the two page GE summary/reflection into the program plan template. Is two pages too much in a 25 page report?

Meeting adjourned 4:00pm

# **Curriculum & Research**

## **Agenda**

Monday, March 20, 2017

2pm-4pm, SH 331

1. Approval of last meeting minutes (3/6/17).
2. Updates:
  - a. BA, Mexican American Studies approved by CO
  - b. HSPM name change was approved by the Provost
  - c. Policy overload?

### Curriculum

3. ORTU: Institute for the Study of Sport, Society and Social Change
  - a. Time Certain: 2:00pm Camille Johnson, Chief Operations Manager to the Provost
4. Discontinuation of Three Concentrations and Minor in Environmental Studies
  - a. ENVS folder
  - b. Time Certain: 2:30pm Lynne Trulio, Chair, Environmental Studies

### Policy

5. Program Planning: Policy Draft, Guidelines
6. RSCA: Review of feedback
7. Department Name Change Policy Draft

## Curriculum & Research

### Meeting Minutes

Monday, March 20, 2017

2pm-4pm

**Present:** Thalia Anagnos, Megan Chang, Shelley Cargill, Richard Chung, Beverly Grindstaff, Scott Heil, Eric Medrano, Toby Matoush, Ravisha Mathur, Simon Rodan, Pamela Stacks, Lynne Trulio

**Absent:** Peter Buzanski

**Guest:** Camille Johnson (Chief Operations Manager, Provost's office)

1. Approve Meeting Minutes from March 6, 2017

**\*\*ACTION-** Approved Meeting Minutes from March 6, 2017. **8-Yes, 0- No, 2- Abstain**

2. Updates

- a. The BA Mexican American Studies is close to being approved by Chancellor's Office.
  - b. The Hospitality name change was approved.
  - c. Issue brought up by Peter Buzanski last week, was discussed in faculty executive committee and it was noted there are ebbs and flows in policy creation. We are receiving many referrals now; while dealing with instability in governance fewer referrals were coming in. Some years 5 policy recommendations discussed in senate in total.
  - d. ISA has asked C&R to consider the issue of getting the Humanities Honors program (or similar programs) to appear on transcript as an Honors classification. This is just a request for preliminary feedback of this proposal to see if this would be an acceptable path for Honors on a transcript. C&R recommended minimum units for this path and GPA eligibility. It was noted that some of the courses in Humanities Honors state 'honors' in the title; so changing this pathway may be redundant.
  - e. Intellectual Property policy has been updated by the Chancellor's office. One big concern is that faculty were not consulted on the update. It appears only Chancellor's office staff was involved. Executive Committee of the Senate is crafting a Sense of the Senate resolution, but individuals may want to respond as well.
3. ORTU- Institute for the Study of Sport, Society and Social Change
- a. Goal is to bring in various departments to come together to talk about social justice in sports. Sports do have impacts on social justice issues. This institute would use sports to promote social justice.
  - b. This Institute will be housed in the Provost's office in order to keep the center as interdisciplinary as possible.
  - c. Goal is to work with professional sports teams like the FortyNiners and Warriors to endow the center over time (focusing on year 4 or 5). Director stipends for the first two years will be covered from funding guaranteed by advancement and other campus groups.

- d. This is a great way for campus athletes and alums to give back to the university and the community by promoting social justice issues.
- e. It is not clear in introduction on how each sport can or does contribute to/impact social justice.
- f. The staff won't merely be faculty, but staff involved in sports management and athletics as well.
- g. Suggest having someone from Justice Studies review paragraph on athletes and police for instances of institutional racism.
- h. Adjust a few paragraphs, add structure to academic advisory board paragraph, be more specific about how executive director is funded and their retreat rights (if applicable), highlight the metrics of success, a statement about how the director will conduct outreach.
- i. Motion to table discussion to another meeting.
  - i. Seconded.
  - ii. After discussion, motion is withdrawn.
- j. New Motion to have proposal returned to requester with memo outlining revisions being suggested by committee.
  - i. Seconded
  - ii. List of essential/non-essential recommendations will be created and sent to the committee to review by Wednesday. Final comments on this list by Friday.

**\*\*ACTION-** Approved motion to send proposal back with requested revisions. **10-Yes, 0-No, 0- Abstain**

- 4. Environmental Studies Concentration and Minor discontinuation.
  - a. Currently have a BA and BS plus a BS with three concentrations.
  - b. Found that students were having problems enrolling in minors.
  - c. Found that the minor in energy policy was not attracting sufficient students.
  - d. Department reviewed programs and enrollments and determined that they would propose the concentrations as minors, and then discontinue the concentrations.
  - e. The department faculty fully supported this curricular change,

**\*\*ACTION-** Approve Discontinuation of ENVS BS concentrations and Minor in Energy policy. **10-Yes, 0- No, 0- Abstain**

- 5. Program Planning
  - a. Guidelines and policy will be reviewed every five years. This will ensure that the adjustments are in place by the time a cycle circles back around.
  - b. Cleaned up language around review of minors that are housed by department and utilized as a program requirement in their degree.
  - c. Certificates are outlined in the policy and need to have the guidelines reflect their inclusion. Mostly around the viability of program than around assessment.

Meeting adjourned 4:00pm.

## **Curriculum & Research**

### **Agenda**

Monday, April 3, 2017

2pm-4pm, SH 331

1. Approval of last meeting minutes (3/20/17).
2. Graduate University Learning Goals
  - a. Time Certain 2:00pm: David Bruck, Associate Dean of Graduate Studies (will bring graduate ULGs to the meeting)
3. Draft of Senate Resolution on CSU Intellectual Property - any C&R feedback
4. ORTU: Institute for the Study of Sport, Society and Social Change
  - a. A memo outlining how concerns raised by the committee were addressed
  - b. A revised proposal (changes are indicated by underlined text)
5. RSCA: Feedback and First Reading
  - a. Key questions/items to consider:
    - Close review of First Reading draft (which has all comments, feedback from individual policy feedback merged in) + Subcommittee feedback
    - Is this policy only discussing RSCA from a student success perspective?
    - Are there conflicts between the first two sections? Particularly between students and RSCA advisors (roles, responsibilities, employee vs. student)?
    - How much Intellectual Property discussion should be in the policy?
6. Program Planning: Policy and Guidelines
  - a. Key questions/items to consider:
    - Curricular, financial, workload impact statements
    - Should the appendices and template be kept separate from the guidelines?
    - Review of certificates and minors?
    - Adding in GE section (is this a workload issue)?
7. Department Name Change: Draft policy

## Curriculum & Research

### Meeting Minutes

Monday, April 3, 2017

2pm-4pm

**Present:** Thalia Anagnos, Peter Buzanski, Megan Chang, Shelley Cargill, Richard Chung, Beverly Grindstaff, Scott Heil, Eric Medrano, Ravisha Mathur, Pamela Stacks, Lynne Trulio

**Absent:** Toby Matoush, Simon Rodan

1. Approval of meeting minutes from March 20, 2017 (7- 0- 1)
2. Changes to university learning goals (ULGs)
  - a. David Bruck explained the history of university learning goals at SJSU and the need for distinct graduate learning goals at the program level. There are different ways to make them distinct from undergraduate goals, but the proposal is to have one set of ULGs for all of SJSU that is sufficiently broad to cover both undergraduate and graduate, and then each program's goals can be appropriately mapped to them. At SJSU, the proposed new language has been making its way through other committees such as Associate Deans group and UCCD.
  - b. Discussion of the use of the words such as "tools" and "graphical" under intellectual skills and whether they cover all disciplines
  - c. Discussion of whether intellectual fluency should include all the exemplars listed or some subset ("and" versus "and/or")
  - d. Discussion of whether undergraduate "understanding" of broad academic areas is correctly described under intellectual skills or better listed as a form of integrated knowledge. The distinction of knowledge versus skills was noted.
    - i. A question was raised whether undergraduate GE is integrated because it may be experienced as separate disciplines with no attempt at integration; however, it is written in the GE guidelines that the goal of GE is to make such connections across disciplines.
  - e. Intellectual skills might imply something about how a student interacts with others' intellectual property (plagiarism, etc.). But the "ethical information gathering" clause may address this.
  - f. It was noted that the deep integration of Arts and Sciences has been a goal of SJSU and higher education for many decades, but not necessarily with much success.
    - i. The ideal of integration is not always expected for very unrelated areas of study.
  - g. Language about diversity and the SJSU community was modified to make it more attainable for every discipline. The SJSU CDO has advised on those changes.

- i. Proposal to move social and global responsibility to the top, place more emphasis on civic engagement.
    - h. There is concern about the use of the word “measurement” in intellectual skills and if other words might be better.
    - i. C&R decided to ask UCCD or other outside stakeholders about these issues before making a decision. Additional concerns will be mentioned at the UCCD meeting and they can choose whether they want to respond.
3. Revisions were received for the proposed ORTU for Sport, Society and Social Change addressing many of the earlier points raised by C&R.
- a. Issue raised on whether the role of athletes should be described as “are” versus “can be” because not every athlete is bringing social issues to the fore.
  - b. Academic advisory board process has been added.
  - c. Vote to approve was unanimous (11-0-0) with revision on “are” versus “can be.”
4. CSU Intellectual Property proposed policy
- a. The SJSU Senate Executive Committee decided to assign the response to this proposal to the Professional Standards Committee because it needs more faculty involvement. C&R will give feedback to Professional Standards for use in a sense of the Senate resolution.
    - i. Three key areas of concern have been already noted by SJSU faculty:
      - 1. The proposed policy is more restrictive than those used at the UC or other R1 schools.
      - 2. The policy did not result from a thorough consultative process, and does not take into account campus policies that already exist.
      - 3. The result of the policy would be to put research increasingly into labor agreements as something to be negotiated rather than a faculty right decided at the campus. It would give more control over research to the administration including at the system level.
    - ii. It was noted that the benefits of holding a patent may be greater to individual faculty than to the institution because it builds their CV and establishes them as an innovator in their professional circles.
    - iii. There are funding implications if the university will retain the IP. The campus needs to decide how to allocate funding. There was no funding attached to this more restrictive policy. It could be an unfunded mandate.
    - iv. Another suggestion was to treat the policy as model, but not binding and each campus can adopt its own policy.
    - v. There are also legal implications for what has been vetted by the CSU general counsel. Individual campus policies would need to be reconciled with the legal requirements.
      - 1. Suggestion that the CSU move closer to the UC model
    - vi. The ownership of the curriculum is also in question. Some of the biggest areas where the CSU could innovate is in curriculum and instruction, such as how SDSU has done tech transfers of innovations in this area.

- vii. In the past the university has not always been helpful or consistent for faculty or student ownership of IP; sometimes contradictory. Sometimes the university wants to collect royalties without providing enough support. The CSU proposal could create more problems and local control would be better.
- viii. C&R will vote online using a Google doc for which issues/language to bring to the Senate. Individuals can also make their own amendments on the Senate floor.

#### 5. RSCA policy draft review

- a. Current draft came out of the RSCA subcommittee and given to the full committee. A new draft will go to first reading in the Senate on 4/10/2017.
- b. There will be more chances for C&R to make changes afterwards if needed.
- c. The words “conduct of” were removed from the policy title.
- d. Question raised whether certain policy lines should refer to faculty alone, or “faculty, staff, and students.” It was agreed to make the language broad to cover anyone engaging in RSCA.
- e. Questions about why the rationale section contains so many value statements rather than just getting straight to the policy. Some faculty prefer including a statement of values and an acknowledgement that RSCA happens alongside other faculty duties. It may provide a sense of where SJSU intends to be with RSCA funding and practices as an evolving process. For now C&R agrees to remove some of the values background text because the conditions have changed and there is a common understanding that SJSU actively supports RSCA, so it may not need to be advocated any further in this policy.
- f. Some questions about the draft policy from others outside the committee asked why only three areas of RSCA are addressed. The goal for the current policy is not to be comprehensive about all aspects of RSCA; it only covers areas that need immediate policy guidelines for legal or other reasons.
- g. Other questions came up about what happens when students have an academic conflict of interest in the RSCA activity. The department chair should be brought in as the first review. It may eventually go to the Office of Research but that will not be stated in the policy. Students have multiple channels of recourse if they have a problem. Draft policy was modified to refer to the chair’s role and not to the Office of Research.
- h. Language was simplified about students’ right to know the RSCA funding source.
- i. Language about the Research Foundation and Tower Foundation grants administration titles and offices may need to change, but was left alone for now.
- j. C&R ran out of time to finish discussion of remaining proposed changes to the draft. Because the goal is to get to a first reading in the Senate next week, the remainder of the edits will be covered online vote on a draft compiled by the chair following any further comments in the document.

Meeting adjourned 4:04pm.

# Curriculum & Research

## Agenda

Monday, April 17, 2017

2pm-4pm, **SH 449** (note different location)

1. Approval of last meeting minutes (4/3/17).
2. Updates:
  - a. Internship policy on hold. Email from Chancellor's office saying that students won't be covered by SAFECLIP if no UOA is on file. So all students who self-place will not be covered with student insurance program.
3. RSCA: Final Reading Draft
  - a. Key questions/items to consider:  
Curricular, financial, workload impact statements  
New NDA section
4. Program Planning: Policy and Guidelines: Folder
  - a. Draft, Guidelines, Data Elements
  - b. Key questions/items to consider:  
Curricular, financial, workload impact statements  
Should the appendices and template be kept separate from the guidelines?  
Review of certificates and minors?  
Adding in GE section (is this a workload issue)?
5. University Learning Goals: Folder
  - a. ULGs Draft, Bruck feedback
  - b. Senate Policy Recommendation Draft
6. Department Name Change: Draft policy

## Curriculum & Research

### Meeting Minutes

Monday, April 17, 2017

2pm-4pm

**Present:** Thalia Anagnos, Peter Buzanski, Megan Chang, Shelley Cargill, Richard Chung, Beverly Grindstaff, Scott Heil, Eric Medrano, Ravisha Mathur, Simon Rodan, Lynne Trulio

**Absent:** Toby Matoush, Pamela Stacks

**Guests:** Gilles Muller (Office of Research)

1. Approval of meeting minutes from April 3, 2017. 8- Yes, 0- No, 1- Abstain
2. Updates
  - a. Internship Policy has been placed on hold due to the Chancellor's Office risk management stating that the policy would be out of compliance because students without UOA's (self-placed) would not be covered by Safeclip. With this in mind, the chair has requested that the President not sign the policy until issue is cleared up.
3. RSCA Policy
  - a. Adjusted language when referencing faculty. We should include other groups that might be involved (staff, students).
  - b. Clarifying the reference to consequences on B. Alignment of Commitments and Obligations
  - c. Section III, renamed to Proprietary and Confidential Information in RSCA.
  - d. RSCA member(s) involved in the project should not sign NDA without administrative authorization.
  - e. Need to obtain a bit more clarification on NDAs from University counsel before moving forward to the senate final reading.
4. Program Planning
  - a. The policy will have a first reading on May 1st.
  - b. Simultaneously the policy will be sent to Deans, Associate Deans, and UCCD.
  - c. C&R has purview over guidelines, senate does not get to vote on them, only review. This was confirmed by the Executive Committee.
  - d. GE guidelines will be referenced even though nothing exists now regarding PPC submissions, when GE guidelines are updated and this review will be included in the update.
  - e. Including language that requires departments to discuss the compliance with EO 1071.
  - f. Scott will adjust the metrics section and update the required data elements page.

Meeting adjourned 4:04pm.

# **Curriculum & Research**

## **Agenda**

Monday, April 24, 2017

2pm-4pm, SH331

1. Approval of last meeting minutes (4/17/17).
2. Updates:
  - a. Internship policy- What to do?
3. RSCA: Final Reading Draft
4. Program Planning Policy and Guidelines: Folder
  - a. Draft, Guidelines, Data Elements
  - b. Initial Feedback from PPC chair
5. University Learning Goals: Folder
  - a. ULGs Draft, Bruck feedback
  - b. Senate Policy Recommendation Draft
6. Department Name Change: Draft policy

## Curriculum & Research

### Meeting Minutes

Monday, April 24, 2017

SH 331

2pm-4pm

**Present:** Thalia Anagnos, Peter Buzanski, Megan Chang, Shelley Cargill, Richard Chung, Beverly Grindstaff, Scott Heil, Toby Matoush, Eric Medrano, Ravisha Mathur, Simon Rodan, Pamela Stacks, Lynne Trulio

1. Approval of meeting minutes from April 17, 2017.

**\*\*Action Item:** Approve Meeting Minutes from April 17; **7- Yes**, 0- No, 2- Abstain

2. Updates

- a. Internship Policy- EO 1064 says students should have SAFECLIP provided if enrolled in a course. Zach Gifford stated that we should have a UOA in place in order to be covered by SAFECLIP. We can push back and AVP Faas has recommended that we do and work with the new campus Risk Manager Marla Perez to move that forward as this directly impact student success. The SafeClip agreement with the CSU is where the issue is and the CSU should get clarification about coverage. The campus seems to be supportive of our new policy and find that the UOAs are a barrier; the new policy helps students find their own placements and reduces faculty workload.

3. RSCA Policy

- a. Reviewed by Pam Stacks and CSU counsel Steven Silver, who suggested we "Flesh out what individual, private and consulting projects" involve. This involves only SJSU students and faculty.
- b. Added language regarding sponsors limited input on NDAs.

**\*\*Action Item:** Approve moving the RSCA policy to senate for final reading; **13- Yes**, 0- No, 0- Abstain

4. Program Planning Policy

- a. AVP Anagnos will take this to deans so they can see it.
- b. Senate can only vote on policy; the guidelines will be sent as an informational item.
- c. PPC chair feels RSCA should be highlighted more and research should be referenced in the guidelines more clearly. RSCA language was added in some aspects of the guidelines. Is RSCA a department activity? Or is it a faculty activity? The fourth goal allows departments to discuss their RSCA.
- d. We will inform them that feedback on the guidelines will be accepted, but really senate can only review and pass the policy.
- e. Policy feedback in by May 4th. Guidelines can submit feedback by end of semester to be implemented for the upcoming academic year. All feedback after

that point (on guidelines) will be accepted but implementation of feedback may be held off until guidelines circle around for update (which may or may not happen annually).

- f. Faculty hires: The tenure density issue can be addressed through PP. The issue isn't necessarily with budget and resource needs, but the issue is that there is no funding and so departments have to justify need; departments should outline how faculty hires support student success.
- g. Data elements document will be a separate document from guidelines and referred to in guidelines. This is a separate document so that changes won't need to run through the senate. It is a reference guide for programs (RDEs).
- h. Certificates and Minors will be included in new program planning policy.
- i. Clarified first section on program recommendations for proposed action items by the department.
- j. External environment change(s) data should come from alumni surveys, industry partners, review of policy changes, etc.

**\*\*Action Item:** Approve moving the Program policy to senate for first reading; **13- Yes**, 0- No, 0- Abstain

5. University Learning Goals-

- a. Adding graduate level specific ULGs since they don't align with the undergraduate goals.
- b. Has been reviewed by UCCD, but still needs review from PPC and the Deans.
- c. Clarified that point three on Intellectual skills is referencing undergraduate degrees not graduate.
- d. Should it be skills or knowledge?
- e. These ULGs are being rewritten to ensure the ULGs could inclusive of both undergraduate and graduate program curriculum.

**\*\*Action Item:** Approve moving the University Learning Goal policy to senate for first reading; **10- Yes**, 0- No, 0- Abstain

Meeting adjourned 4:05pm.

## **Curriculum & Research**

### **Agenda**

Monday, May 8, 2017

2pm-4pm, **SH449** (Note room change)

1. Approval of last meeting minutes (4/24/17).
2. Updates
  - a. RSCA policy
3. Program Planning Policy and Guidelines: Folder
  - a. Policy Recommendation Draft, Guidelines, Data Elements
4. University Learning Goals
  - a. Senate Policy Recommendation Draft
5. Department Name Change: Draft policy
6. Blended Programs Referral

**Curriculum & Research**  
**Meeting DRAFT (NOT YET APPROVED) Minutes**

Monday, May 8, 2017

SH 449

2pm-4pm

**Present:** Thalia Anagnos, Peter Buzanski, Megan Chang, Shelley Cargill, Richard Chung, Beverly Grindstaff, Scott Heil, Toby Matoush, Ravisha Mathur, Simon Rodan, Pamela Stacks, Lynne Trulio

**Absent:** Eric Medrano

1. Approval of meeting minutes from April 24, 2017.

**\*\*Action Item:** Approve Meeting Minutes from April 17; **11- Yes**, 0- No, 0- Abstain

2. Updates

a. Discussion of SAFECLIP and Internship policy: Information from the chancellor's office has necessitated a change to the policy. After discussion within the executive committee, it was noted that as the policy recommendation has already been passed by the Senate, no changes from the committee can be made. The committee discussed how Risk Management needs to work with the Chancellor's Office to resolve this issue. We hope to be able to retain the liability coverage and reduce faculty workload with our policy recommendation.

**\*\*Action Item:** Ask SJSU Risk Management to work with the Chancellor's Office Risk Management to clarify the difference between the information on the CSU website and the information received from Zach Gifford (11- Yes, 0-No, 1- Abstain)

b. RSCA policy: Although the policy has been passed by the Senate, one individual raised concerns with language in RSCA policy related to NDAs. Senator Stacks noted that the McKee transparency act (sec 72696.5) does allow for trade secrets to be kept from disclosure, but must be redacted from auxiliary records before disclosure. Possible solutions for change: 1) Ask the President to refer back to the committee; 2) President could sign and write an amendment after discussion with faculty. Provost Feinstein has asked for a paragraph explaining C&R thoughts on the issues.

**\*\*Action Item:** Ask Chair Mathur to write summary paragraph to describe the implications of the language and its interpretation. Paragraph will be sent to committee for review before forwarding to the Provost. The C&R Committee recommends signing the policy as written. (10-Yes, 1-No, 1-Abstain)

3. Program Planning Policy Review and Discussion of Guidelines

a. Clarified minor issues for final reading of the policy recommendation

**\*\*Action Item:** Approved motion to move the policy recommendation to the senate as a final reading (12-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain)

b. Program Planning Guidelines

i. Reviewed comments on draft guidelines, still have a few items to review before approval. Can approve the policy without the guidelines as

opportunity for senators to review the guidelines was given with the first reading. Will finish up the guidelines in first fall meeting.

4. University Learning Goals Policy Review

- a. Discussed minor issues with wording of the ULGs. Reordered the ULGS based on committee discussion.

**\*\*Action Item:** Approved motion to move the policy recommendation to the senate as a final reading (12-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstain)

Meeting adjourned: 4:00pm

**MINUTES NOT YET APPROVED**