

Instruction & Student Affairs

Year-end report 2013-2014

Stefan Frazier, Chair

<stefan.frazier@sjsu.edu>

Meetings held:	8/26/13	9/9/13	9/30/13	10/7/13	10/28/13
	11/4/13	11/25/13	12/2/13	1/27/14	2/3/14
	2/24/14	3/17/14	4/7/14	4/21/14	

Policies / business completed:

Policies passed in Senate and signed by President:

- F13-1, Students' Rights to Timely Feedback on Class Assignments
- S14-3, Student Fairness Dispute Resolution
- S14-7, Accommodation to Students' Religious Holidays

Sense of the Senate resolutions passed in Senate:

- SS-F13-7, Distribution and Spending of Funds from the Student Success, Excellence, and Technology Fee (SSETF)

Referrals tabled or put on hold:

- ISA-F13-1, Add/Drop dates
- ISA-F13-2, Academic integrity
- Academic advising overhaul

Referrals otherwise dealt with:

- UNVS 290 and RP grades. Provost Feinstein had made the referral, noting that departments were unhappy with the single fee across campus and wanted more fee options. AD Bruck is working with AVP Stacks and the Provost to develop these options within existing policy. No need for policy change.

Policies / SOSs passed in committee but not passed in Senate:

- (None.)

Policies / business unfinished:

- Revisit of academic integrity / grade disputes: how to handle cases in which students have been accused of plagiarism but found not guilty, yet the instructor refuses to change the "F" grade. Ombudsperson Brooks referral.

Instruction & Student Affairs Committee

Meeting of 2014-04-21, 2-4 pm

AGENDA

Scribe: Bill Campsey

Note: the accompanying files should be downloaded and opened in Word, as they sometimes contain "Comments" that can't be viewed in Google Drive.

1. Approval of minutes of 04-07
2. Class section cancellation draft policy – preparation for first reading
Please remember: we're preparing this for just a first reading, to get an indication of how the Senate feels about it. It doesn't have to be perfect; let's focus on the overall gist, and get to the details after it comes back.
3. Religious accommodation draft policy – prepare for final reading
4. RP units and UNVS 290 – policy revisited
5. Adjournment

Instruction and Student Affairs Committee April 21, 2014 – Meeting Minutes

Notes taken by B. J. Campsey

Members Present:

Ayala, Branz, Brooks, Bruck, Campsey, Culatta, Frazier, Hebert, Hernandez, Jabagcourian, Jeffrey, Kelley, Kress, Rosenblum, Sofish, Walters.

Members Absent:

Fujimoto, Gupta, Wilson.

Guests:

None

Minutes of April 7, 2014 were approved unanimously.

Class section cancellation policy for under-enrollment

Chair Frazier reminded the Committee that the policy under discussion was being prepared for a first reading, and thus, perfection was not the goal. Rather, he indicated that our purpose should be to present the essence of the proposed policy and let the Senate provide its input, which will provide the framework for our final presentation.

Two significant questions emerged in the discussion that followed. First, how often are class sections cancelled after classes begin? The Committee determined that the number didn't matter since it inevitably impacted students in the cancelled section, which made it important. Second, how many days should a section remain open before cancellation? The Committee decided to receive the Senate's input on the question before forming a conclusion. The Committee also requested Chair Frazier to consult with the University Council of Chairs and Directors (UCCD) for their comments before the policy was presented to the Senate for first reading.

A motion was made and seconded to present the proposed policy to the Senate for First Reading – passed 14-0-1.

AS 1533 – Accommodation to Students' Religious Holidays Policy

Chair Frazier commented that the Senate was generally positive to the proposed policy during its first reading.

A suggestion was made to include cultural holidays to the list of religious holidays. After discussion, the proposal was withdrawn as it was deemed too complicated and potentially unmanageable. There was also discussion concerning the date by which a student must notify the instructor regarding a conflict between a religious holiday and the course syllabus. It was concluded that the language, which proposes notification before the end of the "add" period, was a sufficient compromise.

A motion was made and seconded to present the proposed policy to the Senate for a Final Reading – passed 11-1-0 with two committee members deciding not to vote. There were no abstentions.

Policy F11-2

As an information item, Chair Frazier informed the committee that a new set of variable fees would be instituted by departments for in-progress thesis or graduate project courses while students were completing scholarly or creative activities (RSCA). Departments will choose which level of fee will be imposed based on the effort required by the department's faculty in supervising the project. David Bruck clarified what he, Dean Stacks, and Provost Feinstein had been discussing regarding the fee structure. It was determined that the policy was moot for our Committee and it was tabled.

Other business

A very short discussion was initiated regarding whether the University's SOTE policy should be included on every syllabus. Chair Frazier indicated that a referral would be made to bring this question to the I&SA Committee in the future.

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded at 3:36pm.

Instruction & Student Affairs Committee

Meeting of 2014-04-07, 2:30-4 pm

AGENDA

Scribe: Bill Campsey

Note: the accompanying files should be downloaded and opened in Word, as they sometimes contain "Comments" that can't be viewed in Google Drive.

1. Approval of minutes of 03-17
2. Class cancellations draft policy – see *very rough* draft, as well as original referrals, in Google folder
3. RP units and UNVS 290 – policy revisited. See policy F11-2 in folder. The issue: variable course costs across campus. (David B., could you bring us up to speed?)
4. Adjournment

ISA meeting – MINUTES

April 7, 2014,

Notes taken by Monika Kress.

Present: Ayala, Branz, Brooks, Bruck, Campsey, Culatta, Frazier, Fujimoto, Hernandez, Hebert, Jeffrey, Kress, Rosenblum, Sofish, Walters, Wilson

Absent: Gupta, Jabaghourian, Kelley,

Minutes of our previous meeting (March 17) are approved.

Class cancellations draft policy:

When (timewise, as opposed to enrollments) can classes be cancelled? And what happens once the classes are cancelled? Whose responsibility is it to inform students? Stefan sent out these questions to UCCD (Univ. Council of chairs and directors) for their input.

Kell asked whether this policy will protect classes from being cancelled, or will be to have better policies in place for when a class actually IS cancelled. Stefan says that classes are more frequently cancelled 2-3 weeks before classes even start. In the past, these classes remain open til day 1 of classes. Current practice is to cancel them before they start. The new policy would prevent that. The classes should stay open for meeting at least three times, to allow students to continue to set their schedules and enroll in classes. The problem with this procedure is that for classes that meet once a week, the instructors will be paid even if the course gets cancelled. Also, it is bad for students who were hoping that class can be offered, but now can't get enough units.

UCCD would like to go back to the tradition of consultation with the department chairs before canceling classes.

The current policy refers to "classes needed for graduation" --- as opposed to what, all those courses students take for no particular reason? Do electives count? Classes are offered because students "need" them, so this should really apply to all classes? We need to clarify why we mean by "needed for graduation"? Who is checking that the students actually "needs" the course?

It seems best for everyone involved that the classes should be cancelled early, or allowed to stay open. It is unacceptable for students and faculty to suddenly lose their class 3 weeks into the semester. Deans and departments should consult each other before classes are cancelled. There needs to be flexibility both ways.

How should we quantify the "balance" between large-enrollment courses with low-enrollment courses? Who does that, department chairs or deans?

Automated software advising at Long Beach and SLO? "College source"

When is the decision going to be made? The way we do things now, students are not sure if their class will be cancelled or not.

When we say the "University" shall notify students when a class is cancelled, who exactly does this mean? Chair, faculty, dean? The chair or designee should be the one who notifies students. Notification should be within 24 hours of the course being cancelled. Should there be a peoplesoft message, electronic notification should be immediately when the class is canceled.

A student should get 100% refund if a course is cancelled. This apparently is not the case if a class is cancelled!

There was a question as to whether it is meaningful to have there be a period of time where the class cannot be cancelled. The longer it is open, the more students can sign up, but as long as it can always be cancelled later anyway, there is the risk that students will not sign up.

We need data as to whether a particular class will fill up. Does this class tend to fill up, historically? Department chairs know this best.

Does it help students to have a later cancellation date? Does this improve the chances of the class running? Keeping a class open later seems to help enrollment numbers, but it would be nice to have some data on this trend.

Instruction & Student Affairs Committee

Meeting of 2014-03-17, 2-4 pm

AGENDA

Scribe: Demerris Brooks

Note: the accompanying files should be downloaded and opened in Word, as they sometimes contain "Comments" that can't be viewed in Google Drive.

1. Approval of minutes of 02-24
2. SFC policy draft – preparation for final reading
3. Discussion of a greensheet policy consolidation – complications
4. Adjournment

Instruction & Student Affairs

March 17, 2014

2:00 – 4:00 PM

Clark 412

MINUTES

Present: Stefan Frazier, Marian Sofish, Mary Lynn Wilson, Demerris Brooks (Scribe), Chris Hebert, Victor Hernandez, Sheryl Walters, Mykel Jeffrey, Steve Branz, Monika Kress, Nick Ayala, Vic Culatta, Akshat Gupta, John Jabaghourian

Absent: David Bruck, Akshat Gupta, Rich Kelley, Ruth Rosenblum, Bill Campsey, Kell Fujimoto

Quorum was achieved at 2:05.

The Agenda has been revised to include referrals received on or after March 14, 2013.

1. Approval of 2/24/14 Minutes

Vote: 11-0-0

2. SFC policy draft—preparation for final reading.

- a. Did not vote last time to allow for review by UCCD. Matthew Masucci, Chair of the SFC, presented the proposed revisions to UCCD the week of 3/10/14. It was suggested that the policy be further revised to make it clear that if an agreement is reached at the lower level, the agreement should be adhered to and that there is no opportunity afterwards for a formal complaint.
- b. Added language to IIB: “All proceedings – between aggrieved students, department chairs, school directors, associate deans, – shall be documented in writing (if electronically, then easily retrievable).”
- c. Regarding a student’s right to file a formal complaint, if the agreement is a re-grade and the student is not satisfied with the re-grading, are they relinquishing their right to a formal complaint? No, a student maintains that right but the purpose of the documentation is so that the SFC can see what has transpired prior to the referral.
- d. When we say “proceedings and agreements” we are asking that the meeting participants, dates, and times be recorded along with any agreements that are made.
- e. Added language to identify the involvement of supervisors and AVPs in the informal grievance process.
- f. The reference to 90-5 in the rationale clarifies that we are not imposing new work, simply reiterating what is already required by policy.
- g. A request will be made to the Senate to prioritize review of the SFC policy over the religious accommodations policy to assure that it is addressed this academic year.

Vote: 11-0-0 (two members had not yet arrived)

3. Cancellation of Undergraduate/Graduate classes with fewer than 15 students.

- a. This recommendation was made by UCCD in March 25, 2013, but has not been introduced to ISA before today. May have been under consideration by other committees before coming to us.
- b. The recommendation is that SJSU not cancel classes before the third class meeting. Cancelling classes that late, however, has other implications. For example, lecturers are entitled to pay for the semester after the 2nd class meeting. Additionally, the third class meeting for classes that meet once per week goes beyond the deadline to add.
- c. The rationale for the policy recommendation is that there is no consistent SJSU practice regarding class cancellation yet it significantly impacts learning, graduation, and financial aid. Not cancelling classes before they have met would give students a, opportunity to enroll on the first day, for example, a student who has failed 100W and needs to repeat it but can't pre-register.
- d. There is an instance of a course being cancelled after census. It was recommended that someone from Academic Scheduling walk us through the process of what leads to a class being cancelled.
- e. We should also notify students in advance via email when a class is cancelled. Whose responsibility is it to notify students? If the CMS software can do it, why not do it? At least those students would receive some notification, and ask departments to notify and engage with students about options. Should we ask that special care and consideration be given to Seniors, graduating seniors?
- f. It does not make sense to cancel a lab because the 1 unit lab is covered by the enrollment of the students in the 3 unit lecture. There should be special consideration for component classes.
- g. What if we do registration earlier?—say April instead of June—that would allow departments to identify low enrollment and cancel classes earlier rather than wait until classes start. Can we do pre-registration for repeaters who are now waiting until the first day of class? Because so many dates and so many people will be affected by this, it is a larger and lengthier process. We don't have policies on these timelines but we do have policies on everything that happens after the first day of classes. We also have policies about scheduling. In times of impaction, we will see more policies.
- h. Preliminary suggestions are to allow classes to stay open with some flexibility to departments and Chairs, and to “beef up” notification and interaction processes with the students. Action items—Marian will look at what other campuses do. Changes to registration times are a longer discussion for later.

4. Proctor U and TurnItIn.com

- a. Proctor U is an online proctoring service used in online courses. Students taking exams online using Proctor U are monitored visually and audibly. The requirements are described in the terms and conditions which students should, but do not normally, read.
- b. The questions that have arisen around use of this service are 1) can use of the online proctoring service be required of students, and 2) can they be required to pay for a component of a course that they have already paid for? Some departments use an e-portfolio but the departments pay for it. Others use WebAssign and students are required to pay. What was SSETF intended to cover?

- c. Other students have expressed concern about both privacy and copyright issues as they relate to TurnItIn.com. When students use TurnItIn.com independent of Canvas, they are asked verification questions in the registration process that may be in violation of FERPA. Use of TurnItIn.com through Canvas protects against the disclosure of personally identifiable information but it is unclear how students are made aware of and given the opportunity to review the Term and Conditions of use. How do students know and how are they aware of their rights?
- d. Our role is to determine policy implications.

5. Adjournment:

Vote : 13-0-0

Instruction & Student Affairs Committee

Meeting of 2014-02-24, 2-4 pm

AGENDA

Scribe: Victor Hernandez

Note: the accompanying files should be downloaded and opened in Word, as they sometimes contain "Comments" that can't be viewed in Google Drive.

1. Approval of minutes of 02-03
2. SFC policy draft, preparation for final reading
3. Referral on Add / Drop period (Chris Hebert)
4. Adjournment

Instruction & Student Affairs
February 24, 2014 2:00 PM
Clark 412
MINUTES

Present: Stefan Frazier (Chair), Nick Ayala, Stephen Branz, Demerris Brooks, David Bruck, Bill Campsey, Victor Culatta, Kell Fujimoto, Victor Hernandez (Scribe), Chris Hebert, Mykel Jeffrey, John Jabaghourian, Rich Kelley, Monika Kress, Ruth Rosenblum, Marian Sofish, Sheryl Walters, Mary Wilson

Absent: Akshat Gupta

The meeting started at 2:00 PM.

1. Approval of Minutes of 02-03

- a. The present and absent people were edited to fit who was here.
- b. The date for the last minutes were changed from January 27th to February 3rd.

Vote: 9-0-3

2. Student Fairness Committee policy draft, preparation for final reading

- a. Frazier added into the resolution that S-90 already mandates that SFC should be handled with the department chair and dean of the college.
- b. Brooks did not like the phrasing of "more intelligently equipped" and requested that it be changed back to "better equipped".
- c. Jeffrey mentioned that Associated Students will pass a resolution supporting this policy change on Wednesday.
- d. Frazier asked to delay the vote, so that University Council of Chairs and Directors can go discuss this policy change on March 13th. Ms. Brooks is fine with having this delayed.

3. Referral on Add / Drop Period

- a. Hebert feels that this is unfair to the student, because this process gives the student false hope. There is simply too much work for a student in a week.
- b. Sofish mentioned that this gets discussed several times and the science courses almost always oppose it, due to having a lab. These labs are important enough to the course that a student cannot miss any.
- c. Frazier brought up that the week allows professors to look for students. Deans
mainly give out add codes when other students are dropped.
- d. Hebert suggested that the drop date and add date be provided on the same day, but this runs into too many problems.
- e. Sofish mentioned there were ways around the problem that Hebert brought up. Examples include talking to the department chair first, going through the late enrollment program, and retroactive adding.
- f. Ayala asked if the current system works and Branz responds that it has been working

well, especially for labs. Dropping people from the labs allows for more space, which is the biggest problem for labs.

- g. Rosenblum suggested that the problem here is not the process, but that the student did not know how he ended up in this situation.
- h. Jeffrey brought up that the Executive Committee was going to discuss the notification about a class being cancelled. Frazier commented that this has yet to happen. Sofish suggests that Academic Scheduling should be invited to the next ISA meeting.

4. Adjournment:

Vote: 15-0-0

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 PM.

Instruction & Student Affairs Committee

Meeting of 2014-02-03, 2-4 pm

AGENDA

Scribe: Akshat Gupta

Note: the accompanying files should be downloaded and opened in Word, as they sometimes contain "Comments" that can't be viewed in Google Drive.

1. Approval of minutes of 01-28
2. SFC makeup and procedures
3. Questions for budget report at next Senate meeting. That report is available [here \(click\)](#). The questions we've already started are [here](#). Feel free to add to them anytime (though don't erase other people's questions).
4. Adjournment

Instruction and Student Affairs Meeting

Minutes of February 3

Present: Stefan Frazier (Chair), David Bruck, Bill Campsey, Kell Fujimoto, John Jabaqhourian, Victor Hernandez, Mykel Jeffrey, Monika Kress, Ruth Rosenblum, Marian Sofish, Sheryl Walters, Mary Lynn Wilson, Demerris Brooks, Stephen Branz, Akshat Gupta (Scribe)

Guest: Aaron Miller

Absent: Chris Hebert, Nick Ayala, Victor Culatta, Rich Kelley

Meeting started at 2:05PM

Approval of Minutes of 01-28: 12-0-1

SFC makeup and procedures

Suggestions were discussed on Policy Draft.

David asked if we can have fewer students on the committee and can a sub-committee be formed without a student? Stephen and Demerris replied that if a case is taken by SFC, then a sub-committee prepare a report on it; a sub-committee constitutes a faculty and a student, and every case has to be reviewed by it. A sub-committee can't be made without a student as per the current policy. Administrators can't vote in a committee.

David asked whether students want to wait for a student on a sub-committee. Rich asked what happens if faculty member is on sabbatical. Demerris replied that in such a situation chair can resolve the issue.

Stefan suggested for passing the suggestion to O&G and to senate for 1st reading. Students will be allowed to serve 2 years, so that they can join early semester meetings.

David suggested identifying students before the starting of semester. Mykel mentioned about the minimum GPA requirement for a committee member.

Time line between next level requests is 2 weeks or a week before the last date to register for classes.

Akshat asked about a scenario where a student is not able to pass the course, whereas he/she was not expecting that, the only way for him/her to contact the professor is to have a discussion in the next semester. This doesn't give sufficient time before the last date of enrollment and he/she has to enroll in the class again to graduate on time. Is there a way to expedite such issues before the due date of enrollment?

Demerris asked if course doesn't have a green sheet, should the case be handled at the department or in the SFC committee level. Stefan said this is a violation of green sheet policy. Sheryl said students should talk to the dean at the starting of the semester.

David discussed some grammatical issues in the policy.

Motion to approve for 1st reading as amended by David's suggestions (Mykel), seconded (Rich). 12-0-0.

Following Budget report questions were discussed

1. What changes have been suggested in SSETF committee by administration following sense of senate resolution passed by academic senate? (Stefan)
2. Did IRA fees apply in summer in previous semesters? (Sheryl)
3. SSETF should be used in the same year during which it was collected. Since some part of the fees was not used, so should SSETF be returned to students if not used in a year? (Marian)

Discussion on cancellation of classes

Dean makes the decision to cancel the classes. Some classes have been cancelled after the 1st day of instruction. Stephen said that there should be a good reason to cancel a class after 1st day. Marian said as a campus we are not consistent in communication to the students; chair makes a decision with dean's consultation, there should be a consultation and communication protocol. Demerris pointed that one class was advertised incorrectly and correction was done just one day before the starting date.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:56PM (Mykel), Seconded Marian. 13-0-0

Instruction & Student Affairs Committee

Meeting of 2014-01-27, 2-4 pm

AGENDA

Scribe: Mary Wilson

Note: the accompanying files should be downloaded and opened in Word, as they sometimes contain "Comments" that can't be viewed in Google Drive.

1. Approval of agenda
2. Approval of minutes of 12-02
3. Update: revisions to SFC makeup and procedures
4. Questions for budget report at next Senate meeting. That report is available [here \(click\)](#).
5. Adjournment

Instruction and Student Affairs Meeting

Minutes of January 27, 2014

Present: Stefan Frazier (Chair), David Bruck, Bill Campsey, Victor Culatta, Kell Fujimoto, Akshat Gupta, Chris Hebert, Victor Hernandez, Mykel Jeffrey, Rich Kelley, Monika Kress, Ruth Rosenblum, Marian Sofish, Sheryl Walters, Mary Lynn Wilson (Scribe)

Arriving 2:50: John Jabaghourian

Arriving 3:00 – Demmeris Brooks and Matthew Masucci (Guest)

Discussion on whether to take the approval of the agenda off the agenda – general agreement on that. Decision to switch agenda items 3 and 4.

Correction to minutes of Dec. 2, 2013—Sheryl Williams should read Walters.

Approval of Minutes as amended: 12-0-2

Questions for Budget Report at Senate Meeting of Feb. 10, 2014.

Problem—Internet is down and committee can not view report. Some members have a hard copy and some a previously downloaded version on laptop. Budget report has been delayed for 2 senate meetings. Report might be a long PowerPoint presentation with little time for questions or might have less formal report with much time for questions—unknown.

ISA has asked for more transparency on SSETF fee. Many faculty concerned with fee and transparency. ISA members should ask questions to show wide-spread campus concern.

Questions:

1. Why students charged SSETF fees for summer session? Discussion on fees and history of fees.
2. How amounts and percentages of SSETF funding 6 priorities determined? Do unused funds rollover to the following year? Discussion on if this is possible.
3. Will SSETF fees take the place of additional fees imposed by departments? Ex. Nursing orientation fee \$100 and SJSU transfer fee \$75.
4. See page 16 of report. Compares SJSU with other CSUs. Why is SJSU expenditure on student financial aid 11% of total expenditures and other CSUs average 15-16%? Is this good or bad?
5. Have there been suggestions for changing the membership of the SSETF advisory committee? Discussion of possible solutions already discussed in advisory committee.
6. What funds were used to restore the cut classes in spring 2014? Discussion on categories of budget and need for transparency of categories.
7. Will the governor's projected 4-5% budget increase each year for the next few years translate into increases for faculty and staff? Discussion of raises and CFA/CSU Contract for coming year.
8. See page 36. How is SSETF allocated? Confusing request process. Discussion of allocations from old revenue streams and new allocation requests.

Homework for next week—Look over Budget Report and have a question—Send Stefan Frazier questions

Discussion of Freshman Writing Handbook, allocation of funds and distribution of electronic version of book.

Revision of Student Fairness Committee Make up and Procedures

Interim Chair (Aaron Lington) won a Grammy. Demerris Brooks and Matthew Masucci (Chair of SFC) are at meeting with O&G committee to discuss make up of SFC. Problem: Not enough students involved on committee to meet quorum. Discussion on incentives to get students to serve on committee. Suggestions—Pay \$250 stipend at end of semester or early registration. Discussion of early registration. 1400-1500 students get early registration.

Mykel Jeffrey and Victor Hernandez will have a Table for the Student Fairness Committee with goal of getting 15 applications from interested students.

Discussion on students' qualifications and problems. Discussion on ways to streamline SFC process. Current problem is backlog from 2012 and participants in cases not cooperating.

Discussion on difference between S07-6 and current proposal for process for grade disputes and grievances. In old policy, Grade Disputes and Grievances were separated. In new policy, Grade Disputes and Grievances condensed into one policy. New policy replaces sections 2-4 of old policy. Sections 5-7 remain the same. New policy spells out process: First student should discuss problem with instructor and then go to department chair and then dean of college or director of school. This should cut the workload of SFC in half. Grievance process is the same except a grievance can be made against any university employee. Student should contact employee's immediate supervisor. Problem currently is that faculty and chairs are unaware of protocols. Language in proposed policy needs to be cleaned up with regards to sexism, grammar, and specific titles.

Report from meeting with O&G—SFC membership issues could be helped by discussing problem with the University Council of Chairs. Suggestions for streamlining membership process included ability for students to serve multi-year terms.

Straw Poll: Preference of ISA committee if students on SFC receive cash or priority registration for incentive to serve. 19-0-0 for priority registration. John Jabaghourian will take ISA vote back to Student Success Committee.

Discussion on problem of checking student grades if students serve multi-year terms on SFC.

Homework—Stefan will discuss SFC with chair of O&G. Before next meeting—suggest large or small changes of policy. Vote next week.

Discussion on if student needs to get in writing if student attempted to solve grade disputes with faculty member and chair—This would be undue burden on student.

Meeting adjourned at 3:20. All in favor.

Instruction & Student Affairs Committee

Meeting of 2013-12-02, 2-4 pm

AGENDA

Scribe: Victor Culatta

Note: the accompanying files should be downloaded and opened in Word, as they sometimes contain "Comments" that can't be viewed in Google Drive.

1. Approval of agenda
2. Approval of minutes of 11-25
3. Accommodation to religious holidays – preparation for Senate first reading
4. Question brainstorm for budget presentation at next week's Senate meeting
5. Adjournment

Instruction and Student Affairs Meeting

December 2, 2013

Present: Stefan Frazier, Nick Ayala, Akshat Gupta, John Jabaghourian, Sheryl Williams, Rich Kelley, Victor Hernandez, Monika Kress, Marian Sofish, Mary Wilson, Deepika Goyal, Bill Campsey, Chris Hebert, Mykel Jeffrey, Kell Fujimoto, David Bruck

Approval of agenda: MSP 9-0-1

Approval of minutes from 11-25: MSP 9-0-3

Accommodation of Religious Holidays:

1st reading for Senate next week of our policy proposal. Greensheet addition in future to protect students & instructors. Monica: Wording suggests that instructor obliged to let students take late exam or just not to give a zero? But does it have to be the same test given if a student misses one? Could it be final exam, for example? Is that "reasonable effort?" What does "accommodation" mean? CA Educational Code stricter than this: inconvenience of instructor not enough reason for denial of student. Ed Code would say an instructor is obliged to give a retake of the same test. But word, "reasonable," would appear to indicate wiggle room on that too. AEC definition of "accommodation" is legal and strict; may be that can't be used in this policy. Stefan will check with Cindy Marota on this.

Stefan will also ask Julie Paisant about boundary between inconvenient and entirely too inconvenient.

Our proposed wording (*italics in Resolved 1*) less strict than Ed Code. "Quizzes, tests, and exams in class" lacks presentations and other kinds of in-class assignments. So now suggesting (Stefan) to remove the phrase, and replace with "on any graded class work or activities." Should workload impact be included to protect faculty? Chris Hebert brought up Supreme Court case in which a requested TWA accommodation was refused by the company and refusal upheld by the court for allowance of Saturday off for employee. Who would oversee? AEC? Probably not. Court concluded that religion should not be treated like a disability but more like race, age, or national origin.

Financial impact: none

Workload impact: Testing Center can be used for any student (John), not just those with disabilities. Clearly, there is workload impact but "Minimal" chosen.

Enough now for first reading by Senate? Stefan thinks yes.

Motion to approve for first reading (Deepika), seconded (Marian). 14-1-0.

Brainstorming on Questions at Budget Report:

Budget report was meant to occur in October, then in November, but Senate had other business. Delayed because Shawn Bibb out of town in December meeting. Now hearing that it will be in February.

Possibly separate Senate meeting for budget. SSETF: questions from us now on this? May be outdated by February. Our discussion, therefore, delayed.

Ruth Rosenblum will replace Deepika next semester (sabbatical).

Mykel Jeffrey, reports that AS is going to make a push for Spring semester to get students involved and placed on the university committees requiring student membership. Part of the difficulty for the Student Fairness Committee in moving forward is the lack of student representation on the committee. Priority registration as well as iPad borrowing was suggested as a possible incentives to increase student involvement in committees.

The membership and charge of Student Fairness Committee is undergoing changes. These changes will need to be included in the revision of S07-6.

4. Academic Advising policy

The committee revisited the academic advising policy draft. There is a big concern for resources that will account for work load increases. Stefan suggests holding off on the policy until there are ideas that account for the resources required to provide the additional advising services needed.

Meeting was adjourned

Instruction & Student Affairs Committee

Meeting of 2013-11-25, 2-4 pm

AGENDA

Scribe: John Jabaghourian

Note: the accompanying files should be downloaded and opened in Word, as they sometimes contain "Comments" that can't be viewed in Google Drive.

1. Approval of agenda
2. Approval of minutes of 11-4
3. **Time certain, 2:10:** Greensheets, Accommodation to religious creed (Julie Paisant, OEO, guest)
4. SSETF draft policy
5. Revision to S07-6, Student Fairness Committee, grievance process
6. Academic advising cont'd
7. Adjournment

Instruction and Student Affairs
Committee meeting
November 25, 2013
Scribe: John Jabaghourian

Members present: Stephen Branz, Demerris Brooks, Bill Campsey, Stefan Frazier, Deepika Goyal, Akshat Gupta, Chris Hebert, Victor Hernandez, John Jabaghourian, Mykel Jeffery, Richard Kelley, Monika Kress, Marian Sofish, Mary Wilson
Guests: Julie Paisant, Office of Equal Opportunity

November 25th meeting agenda was approved.
Minutes from November 4 were approved (with 1 abstention).

1. Accommodation for religious observances

The committee continued discussion from the previous meeting regarding the possibility of an SJSU policy for exam accommodations for students seeking to observe religious holidays that take place during a scheduled course exam.

Chris Hebert provided wording for a general rescheduling policy rather than one that was specifically for religious observances.

Julie Paisant (guest) provided information about the need to have a policy in place to align with federal government policies that serve to protect religious freedom and thereby also protect the university from litigation. Julie specified the goals of a policy on this matter are to put responsibility on student to provide advanced notice and for faculty to make accommodations.

Additional points that Julie made during discussion and questions include:

- It is Federal policy to accommodate in situations to allow persons to observe a religious holiday. This information was in response to a question that sought clarity on religion being a category that requires accommodation rather than non-discrimination.
- Students and faculty need a place to go in situations where exam accommodations for purposes of religious observance are being requested.
- Religious claims that are made would have to specify the religion and the date.
- Non-religious requests are not protected under a religious claim. Julie suggests specifying religious claim for accommodation rather than making a general rescheduling policy to avoid potential abuse of the policy.
- Exceptions to rescheduling exams for religious observance include reasons that are cost prohibitive (e.g., exam takes place during an off-campus trip) or that the exam takes place during a rare occasion (e.g., solar eclipse).
- Information regarding accommodations for religious observance should be located in a place that students can access so that they know their rights.

The committee discussed if a policy for religious accommodation was made, where that policy information would appear. The committee discussed two options: 1) a greensheet

Instruction & Student Affairs Committee

Meeting of 2013-11-04, 2-4 pm

AGENDA

Scribe: Monika Kress

Note: the accompanying files should be downloaded and opened in Word, as they sometimes contain "Comments" that can't be viewed in Google Drive.

1. Approval of agenda
2. Approval of minutes of 10-28
3. **Time certain, 2:10:** SSETF draft policy (Stephanie Coopman, UCCD, guest)
4. Greensheet policy revision – accommodation for religious holidays
5. Academic advising cont'd
6. Adjournment

policy to appear on all greensheets, or 2) the Student Responsibility and Rights web page that is provided to all new students.

- Greensheet option
 - Bill Campsey among others cautioned about crowding the greensheet with a policy for every possible situation. Others had concerns about policies getting lost in long greensheets.
 - Mykel Jeffrey suggested that the greensheet would be a good location for the policy to appear in that students are more likely to come across the policy in a greensheet over other locations.
- SJSU Student Responsibility and Rights web page option.
 - Demerris Brooks mentioned that that new students get a link to the Student Responsibilities and Rights web page that contains other similar information for students.
 - Discussion continued that a student responsibility and rights statement appear on all greensheets with a link to the web page. This statement would possibly be an addition to the greensheet policy or could revise the current greensheet policy to replace existing information on disability accommodations (and possibly plagiarism/cheating) so that students will find all accommodation, rights, and responsibilities in one location on the web site.

There was general agreement along with some dissent of moving forward with specifying a policy of religious accommodation that emphasizes the responsibility of the student to give advance notice to the instructor. Stefan will put together a policy for the committee to review to be sent forward to the Senate for a first reading.

2. SSETF draft policy

The committee revisited the resolution for SSETF discussed in prior meetings. Stefan pointed out minor additions and changes to the draft made since 11-4-2013. Motion by Mykel Jeffrey to approve the SSETF resolution was seconded by Richard Kelley.

The SSETF resolution was approved unanimously (13 Approved – 0 Reject - 0 Abstain)

3. Revision to S07-6 Student Fairness Committee, Grievance process

Demerris Brooks specified the need for a specified process that is followed to show that good faith efforts are being made to handle student grade disputes and grievances at the department level before being moved forward to the Student Fairness Committee. This revision is needed to alleviate the high extent of grievances that the Student Fairness Committee is encountering. The policy revisions focus on specifying steps that need to be taken by students and the department during a grade dispute. The revision also separates the process for grade disputes from the process for grievances for clarity.

ISA committee meeting Nov 4 2013

Scribe: Monika Kress

Members present: Sheryl Walters, Victor Hernandez, Akshat Gupta, Bill Campsey, Stefan Frazier, Mary Wilson, Marian Sofish, David Bruck, Demerris Brooks, Nick Ayala, John Jabaghourian, Stephanie Coopman (guest), Lynda Heiden (guest), Steve Branz, Mykel Jeffrey

Minutes from 10-28 were approved; this week's agenda was approved.

Minutes from 10-28 were amended to correct the item pertaining to student SSETF fees being charged during the summer. These fees are charged during the summer and there was a bit of discussion regarding whether it is fair to charge the full amount during the summer.

1. Sense of the Senate resolution on SSETF funds

Guest Stephanie Coopman discussed the SSETF funds (student success, excellence and technology fee). Departments and programs can apply for funds via the Instruction and related activities (IRA) fee.

Bill Campsey asked how SSETF is different from IRA, why was one replaced by the other? Stephanie explained that SSETF is specifically to fund technology on campus. There used to be 300 different course fees, which was challenging to administer. They streamlined the process by making one big fund, to produce a reliable source of funds for these programs. This merger of funds was allowed to happen by executive order 1078 from the chancellor's office, and it was approved by CFAC (campus fee advisory committee).

Coopman emphasized the importance of transparency in allocating the funds and providing feedback to all applicants.

Guest and Senate chair Lynda Heiden recommended that there should be chairs and deans represented on the SSETF committee.

Chris Hebert asked whether there was a mechanism to prevent the portion of fees that are "fixed" from gradually becoming 100% as time goes by. Heiden said yes.

Steve Branz said that the total budget of SSETF is dependent on enrollment, but in engineering and science, for instance, the extra funds that are needed for labs can fluctuate from year to year.

Chris Hebert said that the whole fee is being charged during the summer semester, according to his summer students. \$198 was charged for SSETF in summer, which made the total for the year in excess of that amount allowed by

the EO.

Stephanie Coopman clarified that the amount that the departments get back is proportional to the enrollment of the course that the funds are going to support.

Marian Sofish looked at the breakdown of all fees (health, library, documents, etc) and found that summer enrollment is equivalent to that paid by Open U students. The fee applies to all students during the summer.

2. Greensheet policy – accommodation to religious creed

The next item was regarding religious accommodation in the greensheet policy. This topic was proposed due to an incident that started in Biology.

The issue is whether religion should be a reason to have an exam rescheduled. We had extensive discussion as to whether religion is a "choice" in the sense that learning disabilities and blindness are choices that are deserving of special accommodations. The question arose whether religion is "protected" in the same way that other types of individuals are protected (race, sexual orientation, etc).

The original issue arose because the student asked for accommodation the day before the exam. Chris Hebert makes the point that there have been zero instances of this problem occurring when the student gave ample notice, and he suggested that instead of more policies that are in search of a problem, we should have a grievance policy that the students can follow in the event that they feel some unfairness has occurred when they gave fair notice that they needed accommodation.

A related item was concerning the greensheet policy. Steve says that as a campus, we are not in compliance with greensheet accessibility policy; the history is that a CSU campus was sued for not having accessible documents. Right now, the only recourse for non-compliance is to not approve any minor course changes unless accompanied by an accessible greensheet.

3. Advising policy cont'd

The next agenda item was about the advising policy. We continued brainstorming about drafting a policy that specifically addresses the problem that the advising tries alleviate. We wanted to know, what are the exact problems that advising policy is trying to address? There is also an issue regarding a substantial increase in faculty workload, should all majors be required to meet with an adviser regularly throughout their college careers. Nick reported that he had spoken with the President about having advising in general, and the President said it was a great idea.

Instruction & Student Affairs Committee

Meeting of 2013-10-28, 2-4 pm

AGENDA

Scribe: Nick Ayala

Note: the accompanying files should be downloaded and opened in Word, as they sometimes contain "Comments" that can't be viewed in Google Drive.

1. Approval of agenda
2. Approval of minutes of 10-07
3. **Time certain, 2:10:** SSETF draft policy (Stephanie Coopman, UCCD, guest)
4. Revision to F68-18 (revisited)
5. Referral: policy on accommodation to religious creed
6. Academic advising (revisited) (please read marginal comments on documents)
7. Adjournment

Instruction and Student Affairs Committee

Monday, October 28, 2013

2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Call to Order at 2:00 p.m.

Present: Chris Hebert, John Jabaghourian, Victor Hernandez, Bill Campsey, Stefan Frazier (Chair), Mykel Jeffrey, Akshat Gupta, Demerris Brooks, Nicholas Ayala (Scribe), Sheryl Walters, Richard Kelley, Victor Culatta, Deepika Goyal, Stephen Branz

Absent: David Bruck, Kell Fujimoto, Monika Kress, Marian Sofish, Mary Wilson

1. Approval of the Agenda
Moved – Campsey, Seconded – Jeffrey — 10-0-0
2. Approval of the Minutes from September 30, 2013
Moved – Jeffrey, Seconded – Hernandez — 10-0-0
3. Discussion Item: SSETF Draft Policy presented by Stephanie Coopman, UCCD
 - a. Stephanie Coopman will be present November 4th.
 - b. Chair Frazier explained background of the SSETF and some of the concerns: what is the process of requesting funds and disbursement to departments. Jeffrey explained that there is a fee increase per year. Frazier explained there was concern from faculty about how the regulations of fees are handled and transparency of accounting.
 - c. Hebert questions, "What is the aggregate amount collected from students?" Frazier expressed Academic Senate Chair Lynda Heiden had talked with Josee Laroche to see some of the financial breakdown.
 - d. Culatta suggested that the Sense of the Senate draft should also include the fees disbursement and allocation with the inclusion of rollover funding from previous collections. Herbert also suggested that interest should be included in the reports.
 - e. Question for Coopman from brought up by Hebert, "The departments that had their IRA fees and miscellaneous course fees... continue to receive funding *per student* equivalent to the amounts that were previously collected." How are the funds disbursed; to the department or the course?
 - f. Jeffrey - EO1054 IV.A.3 - brought up that majority of advisory committee must be students, but the current SSETF committee, mandated by EO1078, does not fulfill that requirement.
4. Revision to F68-18 — *Students' Rights to Timely Feedback on Class Assignments* (Revisited)
 - a. Feedback from 1st reading: Well received, someone even made a motion for final reading but was determined to return to committee
 - b. Amendments:

- i. Resolve 1: “All students have the right to know, within a reasonable time changed” to “All students have the right within a reasonable time to know...”
 - ii. Resolve 1: Remove examples expressed in the parentheses
 - iii. Resolve 3: Removed and added to rationale
 - c. Motion to approve to final meeting
 - i. Motioned: Kelley; Seconded: Gupta; Vote 13-0-0
 - ii. Branz: present non-voting
5. Referral: Policy on Accommodation to Religious Creed
 - a. F68-8 Policy on religious holiday – cannot be penalized due to attendance to class
 - b. Brooks - In this situation, if students complain – it is a discrimination issue, not a academic grievance.
 - c. Committee agreed a policy should be created or included in the greensheet regarding these accommodations
6. Academic Advising Policy (revisited)
 - a. Senate feedback: Some concerns of resources for implementation.
 - b. Hebert mentioned that competence cannot be regulated by policy
 - i. Ayala questioned if a training process for advisors to ensure that they know what they are advising
 - c. What is wrong with current procedures / policy?
 - i. Hebert - Advisor quality – currently there is inconsistent information given
 - ii. Branz - Degree Audit
 - 1. System offered to fix it – one of the worst in 23 campuses
 - iii. Branz - Flexibility of course choices, student are limited to what courses they can take to count towards graduation
 - iv. Brooks - Non-grad – students that think they are graduating, but no
 - v. Branz - Two colleges mandate advising
 - 1. Can use to measure success of advising
 - 2. CSU Long Beach already has campus-wide advising (model)
 - vi. Gupta - Graduate student pay that same fees yet unable to access advising
 - vii. Brooks – what is the work of Academic Advising & Retention Services, what is the process and criteria so that it is transparent for students to know – no clear timeline, appeal process – no consistency (Section IV.9)
 - viii. Culatta – Road maps to graduation, updated to the requirements and restrictions of the campus
 - 1. Jabagchourian – Student Success Committee reviewed department websites and accessibility to a 4 - year plan
7. Adjournment
 - a. Motion to Adjourn
 - i. Moved - Hernandez; Second Hebert; Vote 12-0-0

Instruction & Student Affairs Committee

Meeting of 2013-10-07, 2-4 pm

AGENDA

Scribe: Rich Kelley

Note: the accompanying files should be downloaded and opened in Word, as they sometimes contain "Comments" that can't be viewed in Google Drive.

1. Approval of agenda
2. Approval of minutes of 09-30
3. Brief explanation of policy writing procedure
4. Academic advising policy – Maureen Scharberg (SASS), guest
5. Revision to F68-18
6. Adjournment

Instruction and Student Affairs Committee

Monday, October 7, 2013

2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Call to Order at 2:00 p.m.

Present: Richard Kelley (scribe), Nicholas Ayala, John Jabagchourian, Sheryl Walters, Akshat Gupta, Demerris Brooks, Mykel Jeffrey, Stefan Frazier, Vic Culatta, Marian Sofish, Victor Hernandez, Bill Campsey, Monika Kress, Mary Lynn Wilson, Chris Hebert, Deepika Goyal, Kell Fujimoto, Maureen Scharberg (guest), David Bruck (guest)

Absent: Stephen Branz

1. Approval of the Agenda
Moved – _____, Seconded – _____ — 14-0-0
2. Approval of the Minutes from September 30, 2013
Moved – Chris Hebert, Seconded – Marian Sofish — 14-0-0
3. Brief explanation of policy writing procedure given by Stefan Frazier
4. Revision to F68-18 — *Students' Rights to Timely Feedback on Class Assignments*

Resolved #1

- a. "assessment" language discussed (deleted "adequate feedback and evaluation")
- b. Kell Fujimoto expressed concern about not being able to create/craft a policy that encompasses everything listed in the draft resolved language.
- c. Stefan Frazier discussed SDSU's policy. Chris Hebert (John jabagchourian, Marian Sofish, Monika Kress, Deepika Goyal, Mykel Jeffrey contributed) would like to replace first resolved with text under rationale, paragraph #1 — currently reads "All students have the right to have any assignments that contributed to their course grades be assessed or evaluated, and receive explanations of that assessment or evaluation, within a reasonable time."
- d. Mykel Jeffrey, Vic Culatta, Demerris Brooks expressed concern about what it means to be provided/know something....needs to be more than a verbal, "you're doing ok in the class".
- e. Final version: "All students have the right to know, within a reasonable time, their academic scores, to review their grade-dependent work (including, but not limited to, tests, exams, papers, class presentations, online discussions, group projects, and field work), and to be provided with explanations for the determination of their course grades." provided by Chris Hebert with further discussion on how to define "review materials" with David Bruck, Chris Hebert, Sheryl Walters, Monika Kress, Mykel Jeffrey, Nick Ayala.

Resolved #3

- a. Mykel Jeffrey discussed the urgency of final reading at Academic Senate. Most agreed that this needs to go to the Senate now as at least a first reading.
- b. Bill Campsey asked to add language under the rationale to discuss changing pedagogical perspectives and the increasing use of technology.

Motion to pass revisions to Academic Senate.

Moved – Rich Kelley, Second – Mykel Jeffrey — 17-0-0 (unanimous)

5. Revision to S89-10 — *Academic advising policy* – Maureen Scharbert (SASS), guest

- a. Discussion regarding support for mandated advising — Monika Kress, Chris Hebert (discussed past 10 years (gotten better)), Rich Kelley echoed support for such a policy and that he believes that advising has gotten better.
- b. Students — Nick Ayala discussed the CSU San Bernardino example. There were many questions about how this happens
- c. Marian Sofish discussed holds on scheduling.
- d. Chris Hebert discussed advising load and resources put towards advising (COEng vs. others). One size does not fit all. Cautioned about becoming too prescriptive.
- e. Nick Ayala discussed Provost Junn’s support of improving graduation rates, etc.
- f. Deepika Goyal discussed release time for advising in Nursing Program.
- g. Maureen Scharberg discussed “ghost” students (those who are holding space in courses, etc. waiting to declare a major). More of a problem than most think.
- h. There was further discussion on mandatory advising for certain milestones.
 - i. During the first semester at the University
 - ii. Upon changing/adding a major and/or minor
 - iii. During the semester following completion of 30 units at SJSU
 - iv. During the semester following completion of 60 units at SJSU
 - v. After completion of 90 units at SJSU (for students who entered as Frosh)
 - vi. Contemporaneously with or prior to applying for graduation
 - vii. If and when the student experiences academic difficulty, including probation and possibility of disqualification.
- i. Rich Kelley and Demerris Brooks further echoed support, saying it’s about creating a culture.....messaging is important (i.e. Orientations).
- j. Chris Hebert — objections: The basic problem is that it’s not resolving the issue of administrators having unlimited authority on forcing advising onto individual faculty members. Stefan Frazier pointed out that in the policy, if it’s approved, forces the administration to “fund” or provide resources for advising.
- k. Marian Sofish discussed technology language (CMS vs. IDS)....software vs. systems. Peoplesoft!

Motion to pass revisions to Academic Senate.

Moved – Rich Kelley, Seconded – Marian — 16-0-1 (passed)

6. SSETF — Student Success, Excellence and Technology Fee

- a. There is concern from the Council of Chairs about the lack of oversight in light of the fees now being distributed.
- b. Mykel Jeffrey and Rich Kelley discussed the make-up of CFAC.

- c. Nick Ayala discussed the SSETF Advisory Committee (not being invited to any meetings this year).

7. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn

Moved – Victor, Second – Vic — 17-0-1

**Instruction & Student Affairs Committee
Meeting of 2013-09-30, 2-4 pm**

AGENDA

Scribe: Kell Fujimoto

1. Welcome to new member: Chris Hebert
2. Approval of agenda
3. Approval of minutes of 09-09
4. Academic integrity policy – to be tabled unless another motion is offered
5. Add / drop dates policy (motion?)
6. Senate Management Resolution from O&G regarding ISA membership
7. Revision to F68-18 “Student rights to timely Explanation of Grades” – policy draft
8. Academic advising policy draft – Maureen Scharberg (SASS), guest
9. Adjournment

Instruction and Student Affairs Committee
Monday, September 30, 2013
2:00 pm – 4:00 pm
Meeting Minutes

Present: Kell Fujimoto (scribe); Demerris Brooks; Mykel Jeffrey; Sheryl Walters; John Jabachourian; Victor Culatta; Rich Kelley; Chris Hebert; Monika Kress; David Bruck (guest); Victor Hernandez; Nicholas Ayala; Marian Sofish; Stefan Frazier; Deepika Goyal; Lynda Heiden (guest); Maureen Scharberg (guest)

Absent: Stephen Branz (non-voting); Bill Campsey; Akshat Gupta; Mary Wilson

1. Agenda for 9/30/13 was approved (10 approved; 1 abstention)
2. Minutes for 9/9/13 meeting was approved (11 approved; 1 abstention)
3. Academic Integrity Policy
 - a. D. Bruck reported that the policy is important for him and S. Branz to discuss.
 - b. Motion to table policy passed (10 approved; 1 oppose; 1 abstention)
4. Add/Drop Policy
 - a. Concern regarding adding students late was discussed. S. Frazier reported that he asked the Executive Committee about whether faculty are required to add students. It is a choice of the instructor.
 - b. Motion to table policy until further needed passed (13 approved)
5. SM-F13-1 Senate Management Resolution
 - a. Student Affairs Representative changed to University Umbudsperson
 - b. AVP of Administration and Enrollment or delegate changed to remove "delegate"
 - i. M. Sofish explained the importance of AVP of Administration and Enrollment and Registrar in ISA.
 - c. R. Kelley stated that if AVP of Admin & Enrollment designee (Registrar), there will be no AVP in Student Affairs
 - d. M. Sofish reported that she would discuss with AVP Willey to get her opinions of policy changes
 - e. Lynda H. suggested to keep AVP of Admin & Enrollment or designee and AVP of Student Services or designee
 - f. D. Brooks/M. Sofish are to provide rationale for AVP of Student Service/ Umbudsperson and AVP of admin & Enrollment/Designee (Registrar)
 - g. V. Culatta asked for a rationale of naming only the AVP of Admin & Enrollment as only AVP on committee.
 - h. S. Frazier stated that he will discuss the resolution with O&G Committee

6. Revision to F68-18 Students' Rights to Timely Feedback on Class Assignments
 - a. Student Fairness Committee receives complaints about grades and not receiving timely feedback that could affect grades.
 - b. The current policy does not take into consideration current class assignments, such as PowerPoint, group assignments, student teaching, etc.
 - c. V. Culatta suggested addressing "reasonable" and "timely" with a specific definition.
 - d. C. Hebert suggested removal of "adequate" and expressed concerns with "All students be provided..."
 - e. L. Heiden suggested using "incremental grades"
 - f. C. Hebert suggested inserting "for all evaluative material."
 - g. D. Bruck reported that grade received has to reflect the feedback received through the semester.
 - h. S. Frazier stated that will revisit F68-18 next week and if any committee members had any language for the policy to send it to him.

7. S89-10 Academic Advising Policy
 - a. C. Hebert expressed concern with 105 units to apply for graduation. That amount may be too late and 90 may be more appropriate.
 - b. M. Scharberg reported push back a few years ago when it was 90 units for graduation. Suggested 90-105 units.
 - c. R. Kelley suggested "first-time frosh" be added to item 4.
 - d. M. Scharberg suggested adding "no more than 105 units" to item 5.

8. Next week ISA meeting to go over Academic Advising Policy in detail to go to Academic Senate for first reading.

9. Meeting adjourned.

Instruction & Student Affairs Committee

Meeting of 2013-09-09, 2-4 pm

AGENDA

Scribe: Sheryl Walters

1. Approval of agenda
2. Approval of minutes of 08-26
3. Discussion of Academic Integrity policy (visiting: Staci Gunner of OSCED; Wendy Ng of BAFPR)
4. Discussion add / drop dates / policy (visiting: David Bruck of GS&R; Steve Zlotolow of IES)
5. Adjournment

Instruction & Student Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes September 9, 2013

Present: N. Ayala, S. Branz, D. Brooks, B. Campsey, V. Culatta, S. Frazier (Chair), K. Fujimoto, D. Goyal, A. Gupta, V. Hernandez, M. Jeffrey, J. Jabaghourian, R. Kelley, M. Kress, M. Sofish, S. Walters, M. Wilson. Guests: D. Bruck, S. Gunner, W. Ng, S, Zlotolow

Absent: None

Meeting Started: 2:00pm

1. Agenda approved.
2. Minutes of August 26, 2013 approved.
3. Discussion of Academic Integrity Policy- Guests: Wendy Ng from BAFPA and Staci Gunner from OSCED
 - a. Referral to revise S07-2
 - b. If the Student Fairness Committee recommends changing a student's grade, the professor can agree to change the grade or not. This recommendation is based on green sheet violations.
 - c. If a student is accused of cheating it goes to OSCED (Office of Student Conduct and Ethical Development). If OSCED finds that the student did not cheat and the professor refuses to change the grade, at this time the student has no recourse. We are looking for a resolution to this problem.
 - d. Steve B. said that one solution was to assign a W. Most of the committee did not agree with this solution. A "W" is a grade and the student might not want a W and the faculty could still refuse to change the grade.
 - e. Marian S. recommends that the grade be changed. If the faculty refuses it goes to the chair and the chair refuses it goes to the dean. And if the dean refuses?
 - f. Marian S. asked if this should go Faculty Affairs?
 - g. Closing: A committee of peers? Administrative process? Marian will contact other universities to find out how they handle these problems. Staci will also contact her peers.
4. Discussion of changing add/drop dates. Right now last add date-14 class days and last drop-9 class days. Guests-David Bruck of GS&R and Steve Zlotolow of IES.

Background: Marian S. Last day to drop must be before the last day to add so empty seats can be taken. Labs only meet once per week so the last day to add must be at least two weeks. Advanced registration is now 10 weeks prior to the beginning of the semester.

 - a. What is wrong with the dates we now use? Why doesn't school always begin on a Monday. That might solve the "once a week" lab problem. Faculty drop date is 14 class days (this does not work-Marian S.).
 - b. Some international students do not arrive until the first day of class or later. They sometimes have visa problems. They also can not pre-register.

- c. Instructor drop policy-student may not be dropped until after the second time the class meets-page 113 of catalog.
- d. Stefan F.-Overall we seem to agree that we keep the dates as they are.

Meeting Adjourned: 4:00pm

Respectfully Submitted: Sheryl Walters

Instruction & Student Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes September 9, 2013

Present: N. Ayala, S. Branz, D. Brooks, B. Campsey, V. Culatta, S. Frazier (Chair), K. Fujimoto, D. Goyal, A. Gupta, V. Hernandez, M. Jeffrey, J. Jabaghourian, R. Kelley, M. Kress, M. Sofish, S. Walters, M. Wilson. Guests: D. Bruck, S. Gunner, W. Ng, S. Zlotolow

Absent: None

Meeting Started: 2:00pm

1. Agenda approved.
2. Minutes of August 26, 2013 approved.
3. Discussion of Academic Integrity Policy- Guests: Wendy Ng from BAFPA and Staci Gunner from OSCED
 - a. Referral to revise S07-2
 - b. If the Student Fairness Committee recommends changing a student's grade, the professor can agree to change the grade or not. This recommendation is based on green sheet violations.
 - c. If a student is accused of cheating it goes to OSCED (Office of Student Conduct and Ethical Development). If OSCED finds that the student did not cheat and the professor refuses to change the grade, at this time the student has no recourse. We are looking for a resolution to this problem.
 - d. Steve B. said that one solution was to assign a W. Most of the committee did not agree with this solution. A "W" is a grade and the student might not want a W and the faculty could still refuse to change the grade.
 - e. Marian S. recommends that the grade be changed. If the faculty refuses it goes to the chair and the chair refuses it goes to the dean. And if the dean refuses?
 - f. Marian S. asked if this should go Faculty Affairs?
 - g. Closing: A committee of peers? Administrative process? Marian will contact other universities to find out how they handle these problems. Staci will also contact her peers.
4. Discussion of changing add/drop dates. Right now last add date-14 class days and last drop-9 class days. Guests-David Bruck of GS&R and Steve Zlotolow of IES.

Background: Marian S. Last day to drop must be before the last day to add so empty seats can be taken. Labs only meet once per week so the last day to add must be at least two weeks. Advanced registration is now 10 weeks prior to the beginning of the semester.

 - a. What is wrong with the dates we now use? Why doesn't school always begin on a Monday. That might solve the "once a week" lab problem. Faculty drop date is 14 class days (this does not work-Marian S.).
 - b. Some international students do not arrive until the first day of class or later. They sometimes have visa problems. They also can not pre-register.

- c. Instructor drop policy-student may not be dropped until after the second time the class meets-page 113 of catalog.
- d. Stefan F.-Overall we seem to agree that we keep the dates as they are.

Meeting Adjourned: 4:00pm

Respectfully Submitted: Sheryl Walters

Instruction & Student Affairs Committee
Meeting of 2013-08-26, 2 pm
AGENDA

1. Introductions
2. Approval of agenda
3. Approval of minutes of April 22, 2013
4. Minutes sign-up list
5. Discussion of Advising Policy draft
6. Adjournment

1. Introductions 8 new members, 8 previous members

2. Approval of agenda Approved

3. Approval of minutes of April 22, 2013 1st – Sheryl Walters, 2nd – Mary Wilson. Approved, 14 members present for vote. 7 yes, 7 abstain.

4. Minutes scribe sign-up list

Fall 2013		Spring 2014	
August 26	Deepika	Jan 27	Mary
September 9	Sheryl	Feb 2	Ashkat
September 30	Kell	Feb 17	Mykel
October 7	Rich	Feb 24	Victor
October 28	Nick	March 17	Demerris
November 4	Monika	April 7	Campsey
November 25	John	April 21	Stephen Branz
December 2	Vic	April 28	

5. Discussion of Advising Policy draft

Guest speaker: Maureen Scharberg, AVP for Student Academic Success Services

Maureen provided overview of policy S89-10 and some of the reasons that it needs updating. Cal State Long Beach passed a new advising policy and since they are similar to SJSU in terms of student numbers it is suggested that we review their policy as we make changes to ours.

Issues with our advising policy:

- I. No mandated advising
- II. Students switch from major A with a nice GPA, do not do well in major B resulting in poor overall GPA and perhaps probation
- III. Students need to be advised earlier to prevent problems including students not completing a major in a timely manner or high unit students changing majors without letting anyone know
- IV. Advising appears “piece meal” versus more comprehensive/uniform earlier
- V. Need to get to students earlier in order to advise effectively
- VI. Several examples provided of issues with current advising methods.

Question/comments by committee members:

- a. What is the scope of the problem? Discussed, see above
- b. When was LB policy approved? March 2010, LB has higher graduation rates than SJSU. Group going to LB September 20, 2013 to learn more about their advising policies and procedures
- c. Concern that this is more of an enforcement issue versus policy
- d. May have problems getting departments to comply
- e. Advising models discussed. 1. Distributed among faculty, 2. Individual faculty responsible
- f. Collective bargaining issues with if no release time provided

- g. Discussion regarding advising holds
- h. Lael Adediji available at any time for advising questions from faculty
lael.adediji@sjsu.edu SSC 414, 924-2129
- i. Maureen to find out how LB enforces policy, i. e. incentive hold removal
- j. Discussion regarding policy enforcement for students including mandatory advising after 20, 60, & 90 units
- k. Further discussion at next ISA meeting

5. Other: New referral – revision of add/drop policy

Discussion

- I. SJSU add/drop dates need to be revised
- II. All CSU's have their own schedule for add/drop dates - Maureen Scharberg to share this data
- III. Stefan to collect policies regarding add/drop for committee review
- IV. Deliberate at next meeting

6. Adjournment

Present: N. Ayala, S. Branz, D. Brooks, B. Campsey, V. Culatta, S. Frazier (Chair), K. Fujimoto, D. Goyal, A. Gupta, V. Hernandez, M. Jeffrey, J. Jabaghourian, R. Kelley, M. Kress, S. Walters, M. Wilson

Absent: M. Sofish

Meeting Started: 2:00pm

Meeting Adjourned: 4:00pm

Next Meeting: Monday September CL 412

Respectfully Submitted By: Deepika Goyal