

**Instruction & Student Affairs**

**Year-end report 2014-2015**

*Stefan Frazier, Chair*

*<stefan.frazier@sjsu.edu>*

<b>Meetings held:</b>	8/25/14	9/8/14 (informal)	9/22/14	10/20/14
	10/27/14	11/17/14	11/24/14	1/26/15
	2/2/15	2/16/15	2/23/15	3/9/15
	3/16/15	4/13/15	4/20/15	

**Policies / business completed:**

*Policies passed in Senate and signed by President:*

- Scheduling of Advance Registration and Priority Registration (F14-1)
- Sound Level at Campus Events (S15-2)
- Leaves of Absence for Students (S15-3)

*Policies passed in Senate and not yet signed:*

- AS 1558, Amendment to S10-6, Academic Standards: Probation and Disqualification

*Sense of the Senate resolutions passed in Senate:*

- *none this AY*

*Referrals tabled or put on hold:*

- Elimination of A+ grades. Referral from student. Discussed and tabled, 8/25/2014.

*Referrals otherwise dealt with:*

- Greensheet modification (splitting greensheet into course-specific and university-general material). Tabled as a matter of policy. ISA Chair and GUP will try to coordinate a better greensheet template.
  - *Note: We never got to this. It really needs to be gotten to though.*
- Credit by Exam. Moved to C&R February 2015.

**Policies / business unfinished:**

- AS 1565: Refunds, Drop Policy, and the "W" Symbol (First Reading). *Was on Senate agenda, then pulled in order to wait for new AY. Eva Joice has a copy of*

*this.*

- Final exams, evaluation or culminating activity; Study Day. *In folder "For AY 2015-16." See notes thereon.*
- Academic integrity. *In folder "For AY 2015-16." See notes thereon.*
- Course section cancellations. *In folder "For AY 2015-16." See notes thereon.*
- Mandatory advising. *In folder "For AY 2015-16." See notes thereon.*

**Initiative suggested by outgoing chair:**

- Consolidation of all policies and amendments on (a) greensheets and (b) grading (including, possibly, fairness issues) into one large omnibus policy, in order to make "one-stop shopping" easier for the campus community.

**Instruction & Student Affairs Committee**

**Meeting of 2014-08-25, 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. Introductions all around
2. Approval of minutes of 04-21
3. Course section cancellation, draft policy (to final read?)
4. A+ grades: should they stay or should they go? Initial discussion
5. Scheduling of Advance Registration and Priority Registration, policy revision
6. Adjournment

*Items for future consideration:*

- *Revision of Academic Integrity policy to clarify grade disputes*

ISA Meeting Minutes  
August 25, 2014

Present: Brooks, Branz (non-voting), Bruck (non-voting), Daniels, Crump, Hernandez, Amante, Campsey, Sullivan-Green, Frazier, Walters  
Absent: Sofish, Culatta, Vijaywargia, Goyal, Brada-Williams (excused due to clerical error)  
Notetaker: Brooks

Minutes of the 4/21/14 meeting were approved (5 - 0 - 4)

1. Course section cancellation draft policy:

The Draft policy was presented to Senate at the final meeting in Spring 2014. Issues were raised by the Senate and revisions have been made. An issue identified by UCCD is that Chairs and Directors had been responsible for the listing and cancellation of classes but recently, Deans became more involved and, in some instances, did it themselves. A second issue of concern was extreme late cancellations or cancellations without timely notification. The revised policy required more, rather than less, involvement with the Deans in the process which was not the intent.

This semester the registration period was lengthened. Feedback from individual Chairs has been favorable so far. There is hope that the change will make an impact, so much so, that a policy revision may not be required.

It was agreed to table the issue for 3 weeks to determine if there has been a significant change due to the revised registration period.

2. A+ grades—Should they stay or should they go?

A student complained that an A+ doesn't mean anything and, therefore, they should be eliminated from the grading scale. Title V does not permit grading above a 4.0 and getting rid of the A+ would help to clarify that an A+ does not count for more than an A.

The argument on behalf of keeping the A+ is that it does have meaning in the graduate school evaluation process. Another argument on behalf of maintaining the A+ is the time it would take to change university websites and documents to reflect the change.

The group was unanimously in favor of keeping the A+ as they are a way of rewarding students for effort and are valuable in judging transcripts and a symbol that faculty can award to students as acknowledgement that they have done "something extra".

It was suggested that a notation be added to the catalog defining the value of an A+ on the 4.0 grading scale via a memo to the Registrar and Undergraduate studies.

3. Scheduling of Advance Registration and Priority and Registration

It was suggested that SFC students (7) be added to the Group A list of groups not requiring regular review. This currently includes the AS Board of Directors but they are considering a restructuring that may cause the number of AS Board members involved in this process to change.

The SFC is an essential function of the University. It does not fit the criteria for "B" because the committee does not meet in prime time. The argument was made that SFC involvement does not take the same amount of time outside of classroom as the other listed activities but there is significant work time involved for students on the committee outside of the regular meeting time.

The committee voted unanimously to add the SFC to advanced registration Group A and accept the rest of the policy as written (9-0-0). Chair will forward to Senate for a first reading.

**Instruction & Student Affairs Committee**

**Meeting of 2014-09-22, 2-4 pm**

**Clark Hall 412**

**AGENDA**

***Scribe: Monika Kress***

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

1. Approval of minutes of 08-25
2. Policy recommendation on advance registration / priority registration: prepare for final reading
3. Revision of Academic Integrity policy to clarify grade disputes
4. Adjournment

*Items for future consideration:*

- *(to come)*

Notes from ISA meeting  
September 22, 2014  
Monika Kress

Introduce new members – Gregory Feist new member from Psychology

In attendance: Demerris Brooks, Sheryl Walters, Deepika Goyal, Gary Daniels, Stefan Frazier (Chair), Marian Sofish, Gregory Feist, Monika Kress, Laura Sullivan-Green, Victor Hernandez, Looloo Amante, Victor Culatta, Steve Branz (no-voting)

Approved the minutes from last time

**Advanced/priority registration policy**

Was passed in committee last time. State law says that Veterans receive priority registration. 2<sup>nd</sup> bacc students no longer exist in general, but Deepika says nursing has an exception to that rule. Marian points out they are not credential program students.

Discussion about the scheduling of advance registration: Monika points out that her sophomore-level class is filled up with juniors and seniors.

Marian says that Fullerton uses units earned to determine registration schedule. Marian says there is a “progress to degree”-o-meter that indicates how many classes toward their degree divided by the number of classes they have taken. Steve says that athletics has progress-to-degree down to a science. Contact person in Athletics is Liz Jarnigan.

Steve points out units earned/units attempted is currently used to thwart high-unit seniors.

Gary Daniels points out that students sometimes wind up in high-unit situations for facing personal difficulties through no fault of their own.

Steve points out that there are admissions-related things that can be done to make sure students are not filling up lower division major support courses (supplemental criteria).

There seem to be a lot of registration-related issues that are occurring but that cannot be fixed by any policy that we may pass for priority registration. Thus, committee decided to pass the policy as is now (given that the revision was meant to solve the problem of streamlining Category A students, and other issues are beyond our current scope).

MSP 11-0-1

Adjourned.

**Instruction & Student Affairs Committee**

**Meeting of 2014-10-20, 2-4 pm**

**Clark Hall 412**

**AGENDA**

***Scribe: LooLoo Amante***

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

1. Approval of minutes of 09-22
2. Sound level at campus events – revision of S12-8
3. Policy on bias, discrimination, hate violence, and bullying
4. Leave of absence policy
5. Adjournment

*Items for future consideration:*

- *(to come)*

## Instruction & Student Affairs Committee

Meeting of October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2014, 2-4 pm

### MINUTES

Scriber: LooLoo Amante

**In Attendance:** Stefan Frazier (Chair), Demerris Brooks, Sheryl Walters, Gary Daniels, Victor Hernandez, Looloo Amante, Yu-Ping Huang, Steve Branz (non-voting), Deepika Goyal, Gregory Feist, Monika Kress, Bill Campsey, Laura Sullivan-Green

**GUEST:** Jen Jurgenson – Student Outreach & Recruitment, Chelsye Garrett – Student Ambassador with SO&R, Mykel Jeffrey - Student Ambassador with SO&R/ A.S. Director of Internal Affs.

Absent: David Bruck (non-voting), Marian Sofish, Rich Kelley

### Agenda Items

1. Action Item: **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES from Sept. 22,2014**

**9-0-1**

**Motion Carried**

2. Sound level at campus events – revision of S12-8

*Jen J. & Chelsye G.* - presented on the issue from Students Outreach of when they conduct campus tours with families, prospective students etc. there is a problem of the audience not being able to hear the tour guide. Distributed a handout of the tour routes and a printout out the ChatterVox with their sound levels.

*Stefan:* Elaborated that in the policy the sound limit is 65-85 decibels with the exception of certain departments of organizations, with the approval of Student Union Event Services. Student Outreach is requesting that they be an exception.

*Jen U:* Proposed that they would like to use the ChatterVox, which is a mic that amplifies the speakers voice up to 80 decibels. It will raise a person's voice up to 18 decibels. The ChatterVox is said to help better articulate what the tour guide is saying in comparison to the bull horn.

*Monika-* Asked how long tour guides stop at each stop

*Chelsye G.:* Typically, 5 minutes at each stop

*Stephan-* Mentioned that on the tour route, they don't really stop by classroom areas. Suggested maybe headsets, for people with hearing losses.

*Jen U:* have considered having headsets but at time the tours are 200 people, ChatterVox is \$200 whereas a headset would be \$600

*Stefan:* Pointed out that policy doesn't specify certain areas of location on campus

*Yu-Ping:* Asked if they have ever used the ChatterVox

*Jen:* She attended a conference where they used the ChatterVox and it was way better than the bull horn.

*Mykel:* Explains that at point 7,8,9 is difficult the tour guides because they are competing with construction zones.

*Greg:* Asked what is the current decibel for tour guides?

*Chelsy:* It varies per tour guide, but typically for her, she is the loudest one of them all and is at an 85.

*Stephan:* Suggested they measure the decibel count from the floor and the classroom level from the closest spots to a classroom.

*Gary:* Asked if they give tours during finals.

*Jen:* Said they don't give tours because tour guides have finals themselves since



## Instruction & Student Affairs Committee

Meeting of October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2014, 2-4 pm

### MINUTES

Scriber: LooLoo Amante

they are student assistants.

*Greg:* If they were to present to Senate they should explain that they be an exception because they give frequent tours 4 times a day, 5 days a week.

*LooLoo:* Take notes of their environment surroundings when they do decibel testings.

*Stefan:* Made a suggestion on Section 2, but Mykel didn't like it, so they decided to get the committee to add, "or an ongoing series of events."

*Jen:* Was concerned with approving every year, because the main supervisor didn't want to reapprove every year, and what if chairs say no.

*Greg:* Suggestion instead of singling out groups, identify the events that bother students, identify the complaints and their reasoning.

*Monika:* Identify the groups with the exception.

*Gary:* Legacy Tours would like to be added to the exception.

*Greg:* Create a group umbrella where for instance recruitment would be,

*Stefan:* Mentioned the sense of the committee to consider approval for groups to speak at 65-85 decibel for outreach and recruitment.

*Gary:* Stated he didn't like the verbiage for the policy

*Greg:* Curious on the decibel rules for construction and gardening, and if they would need an exception, because he felt they interrupt classes that are in session when it's by the building.

*Stefan:* Will revise but will not signally specify, Outreach and Recruitment.

### 3. Policy on bias, discrimination, hate violence, and bullying

*Stefan:* ISA was requested to create a comprehensive policy on discrimination, hate violence, and bullying. Many CSU policies focus on sexual assault & title 9 compliance. So now we need to brainstorm, use references with similar policies and possibly adopt or add to create our own. We have certain policies but some have gaps.

*Demerris:* Noticed we don't have a policy for bullying and harassment.

*Deepika:* It would be too big to just have one, and so maybe create subtopics.

*Demerris:* Even with last year's incident, we didn't have a policy to follow.

*Stefan:* Made note we don't have a policy or procedure of what to do, and brought up UC San Diego's principles.

*Mykel:* Asked if this was requested by the president.

*Stefan:* It's not a Presidential Directive, but the president brought it to academic senate.

*Demerris:* Asked if the policy is for the students or for admin.

*Stefan:* Policy should be broad enough for all.

*Gary:* Suggested that we should build from what we have.

*Stefan:* We don't have a university policy.

*Demerris:* States we follow CSU policies but it doesn't have a policy directly for bullying or harassment.

*Stefan:* Mentioned the CSU executive doesn't have a hate crime policy either

*Steve:* mentioned that the committee once addressed university concerns of

## Instruction & Student Affairs Committee

Meeting of October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2014, 2-4 pm

### MINUTES

Scriber: LooLoo Amante

campus climate through admin and faculty.

*Greg:* Asked is the goal to define the policy or provide resources.

*Stefan:* Asked do we want principles or procedures?

*Gary:* Pointed out that we do have a sexual assault policy, utilize the skeletons for our ideas.

*Steve:* Pointed out that we have 3 executive orders 95, 96,97.

*Victor:* Would like to see something procedural.

*Yu-Ping:* Mentioned that it was a broad topic asked to see if the President can send a general idea of what he would like to see.

*Stefan & Demerris:* Mentioned that Stacy Gleixner, Shannon, and Julie, would be good point of contacts.

*Greg:* Looked at his alma mater UMASS policy and they had a procedural policy

*Yu-Ping:* The policy should include online bullying

*Stefan:* Also noted that there should be a time line and that we would oversee it over the few months.

#### 4. Leave of absence policy

*Stefan:* Was provided by David Bruck

*Steve:* Noted that we don't have a policy but we have a procedure. There is currently no policy by CSU. Sometimes student would leave and then come back, while we have an absence policy, he formed an informal committee but is not an official committee of the senate

*Deepika:* Concerned about the 2 year policy

*Steve:* Undergrad has a 7 year end date and 10 year limit excuse. The policy would extend the course limit, recertify the course work.

*Stefan:* How would the policy comply with CSU rule

*Yu-Ping:* Unsure of the verbiage for international students

*Stephan:* David's intent was to discourage students but not allow, but is not guaranteed because of visa access

*Demerris:* Concern about medical leave and the handling, storage, and review of student medical info

*Stefan:* Students may volunteer their medical information, don't want medical reasons float through universities.

*Stefan:* AEC should make recommendations.

*Demerris:* List mental, physical etc. health and primary care giver reasoning.

*Stefan:* Primary care giver should be another category.

*Yu-Ping:* Do animal loss consider as grief?

*Steve:* Suggested that for those reasons, they need to be consoled by counseling services.

*Stefan:* Liked the philosophical background about catalog procedure.

**ADJOURNMENT** - The meeting was adjourned at 3:57 p.m.

**San Jose State University  
Instruction & Student Affairs Committee  
Meeting of 2014-10-27, 2-4 pm  
Clark Hall 412**

**AGENDA**

***Scribe: Victor Hernandez***

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

1. Approval of minutes of 10-20
2. Sound level at campus events – revision of S12-8
3. (tentative) Leave of Absence policy
4. Adjournment

*Items for future consideration:*

- *(to come)*

Instruction & Student Affairs  
October 27, 2014 2:00 PM  
Clark 412  
**MINUTES**

Present: Stefan Frazier (Chair), Steve Branz, Demerris Brooks, David Bruck, Bill Campsey, Gary Daniels, Deepika Goyal, Victor Hernandez, Yu-Ping Huang, Richard Kelley Monika Kress, Marian Sofish, Lauren Sullivan-Green, Sheryl Walters

Absent: Looloo Amante, Gregory Feist

The meeting started at 2:00 PM.

1. Approval of Minutes of 10-20

- a. There were many changes to the minutes, many of them grammatical or spelling errors.
- b. Brooks changed her comment on the Leave of Absence Policy from "SEC" to "the handling, storage, and review of student medical info."
- c. Kelley was added in as an absent member.

Vote: 9-0-2

Approved with the stipulation that the minutes will be handled correctly.

2. Sound level at campus events

- a. The main goal of this policy is to create an exception for Student Outreach.
- b. There was confusion on if the policy is granting approval to Student Outreach or if the Student Union Event Services, the one usually responsible for approval for events, have to grant approval to Student Outreach. It was decided that Student Union will grant approval.
- c. There was debate on if the lawnmowers and other loud equipment would fall under this policy or not. The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) said that the people working these equipment get exceptions, since it is part of their jobs.
- d. Changes were made to the UPD section and the Rationale section of the policy for grammatical purposes.
- e. There was discussion on if the classrooms will be disturbed by the increased decibel levels. However, due the overly complicated process and how the route avoided most academic buildings, this issue was dropped. If there are any complaints, the route would likely be changed to accommodate students.
- f. Members discussed if it was appropriate that all annual events (including Student Outreach) would have to renew their approval every two years. However, no changes were made regarding this issue.

Vote: 12-0-0. Ready for first reading at Senate.

3. Leave of Absence policy

- a. The Chancellor's Office recommended to establish policies on Leave of Absence at each university.
- b. San Jose State can administer a first-semester deferral according to the California Education Code. Most campuses handle this by rolling their admission to the next or subsequent semesters.
- c. For more information on leave of absence, it is allowed for one year and it does not allow for repetition of remedial courses. It can only occur in Fall.
- d. It was established that there was a difference between applying, then asking for deferral and applying, accepting, and then asking for deferral. Accepting is important to keep track of the student.
- e. The catalogue needs to be clearer in saying that there are first-year deferrals.
- f. There was debate on who should decide if someone gets the leave of absence or not. Candidates included the Registrar, Leave of Absence Committee, and Associate Deans. It was decided that Associate Deans should handle Educational Leaves and the retroactive and first-semester leaves should go to the Committee instead of the Associate Deans.
- g. There was discussion on the financial hardships on students. Students would rather work and study as opposed to taking a leave. In addition, it may take a while to get back in if a student breaks admission. There was also difficulties in establishing what exactly is a financial hardship if that is a reason for leave of absence.
- h. It was decided that we needed to draft a policy to establish a process, since we lack one right now.
- i. A revised policy (by Steve Branz etc.) will be brought back to a future ISA meeting.

#### 4. Announcements

- a. There may be an update in the priority system for enrollment, since the system right now is unfair to sophomores/juniors. They may also look at how someone should be given priority within their specific group.
- b. Student organizations are expected to grow to 500+ by Spring 2015. It is becoming more difficult to find Faculty and Staff for every single organization, especially since so many are Academic-related.
- c. There was an Executive Order on banking, saying that all 501c3 organizations and all other university funds must have their accounts on campus. National organizations, like Greek organizations and the Nursing Association, are worried since their funds are on the national scale.

#### 5. Adjournment

Vote: 10-0-0

The meeting was adjourned at 3:41 PM.

**San Jose State University**  
**Instruction & Student Affairs Committee**  
**Meeting of 2014-11-17, 2-4 pm**  
**Clark Hall 412**

**AGENDA**

***Scribe: Gary Daniels***

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

1. Approval of minutes of 10-27
2. Draft policy on sound levels – prepare for final reading
3. Draft policy – credit by exam – begin discussion of draft from Steve B.
4. Comprehensive policy on bias, hate, discrimination, bullying – continuing thoughts and discussion. What should be the scope of this?
5. Adjournment

*Items for future consideration:*

- *(to come)*

Minutes from ISA Meeting  
Nov 17, 2014  
Scribe: Feist

Present: Campsey, Amante, Hernandez, Huang, Walters, Bruck, Branz, Sofish, Sullivan-Green, Kress, Feist, Frazier, Goyal

Minutes from November 3 approved 9 approve; 1 abstention,

Sound Level Policy

- Language: “given *standing* approval” versus *blanket*; should ‘blanket’ be reinstated? Committee likes that and are going back to “blanket approval”
- Question from senator about labor action and whether they should be added to this blanket approval; Committee concluded not to add labor actions to policy bc their sound approval is given through their application with SJSUPD;
- Policy was moved, seconded and approved as is; unanimously approved

Policy on Credit by Examination

- “The Office of Academic Programs & Faculty Development of the CSU Chancellor’s Office has informed the individual campuses that “credit by exam” (CBE) should generate Earned Units toward graduation, but should never generate FTES, nor should student fees be collected for administration of such examinations (beyond the reasonable costs of administering and evaluating such exams)”
- We are doing red blocks incorrectly (see Draft Policy Credit by exam CBE doc) e.g., Waiver exams for US1, US2 (History exams) and Critical Thinking etc SHOULD earn units! And challenge Exam should NOT generate FTES

Type of Exam	Administered by	Earned Units toward graduation	Course registration required & FTES generated	Student fee
AP, CLEP, & IB	External Testing Services	Yes	No	paid externally, unless administered by the SJSU Testing Office
Waiver Exams for US1, US2, US3, and Critical Thinking	SJSU Testing Office	No *	No	minimal administrative fee
"Challenge Exam"	Individual faculty or departments	Yes	Yes *	generally none

- So discussion of committee is to whether to rectify the red squares and the sense of the committee was to do so to get on board; General consensus of the committee is

that we should just get on board as a rationale; everyone is doing it and so we are an outlier;

- Where should CBE be recorded on transcript? On front
- Should we change US3 to PolySci (POLS) since that is what it is?
- Discussion of topics; questions but still needs to be revised by Branz
- Fees through CFAC?
- Committee resolved that Steve Branz will edit and mark as “discussed” and then bring back to ISA for vote and then bring up for First Reading to Senate for discussion

#### Policy on Bias/Discrimination

- Too broad for one document?
- How would each element be implemented?
- Should we borrow from other institutions?
- Why is this coming to ISA? President’s request to deal with incidents when they happen or to prevent them from happening
- Violations of student conduct code already exists
- Committee resolved to have Chair return this to the President’s office with the request that this be charged to a more inclusive university-wide committee or dedicated subcommittee with ISA representation. ISA feels we are too small to be the only responsible party making these policies and/or recommendations.



**San Jose State University  
Instruction & Student Affairs Committee  
Meeting of 2014-11-24, 2-4 pm  
Clark Hall 412**

**AGENDA**

***Scribe: Deepika Goyal***

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

1. Approval of minutes of 11-17
2. Leave of absence policy
3. Referral: greensheet policy modification
4. Adjournment

*Items for future consideration:*

- *(to come)*

Minutes from ISA Meeting  
Nov 24, 2014  
Scribe: Sullivan-Green

Present: Branz, Brooks, Bruck, Daniels, Frazier, Feist, Hernandez, Huang, Kelley, Kress, Rees, Sullivan-Green.

Minutes from November 17 approved; 9 approve, 1 abstain.

Leave of Absence Policy:

- 3<sup>rd</sup> whereas: Confusion if there are limits or no limits on the duration of leave. Clarification that leave awarded based on duration student requested, and student can add to leave after initial request, but it can't exceed the 2 year limit. Change wording to "Limits on the duration of leaves (up to a two-year maximum) should not be imposed as long as the original legitimate reason remains in effect for the students; and"
- Branz clarifies that expected that a returning student would be expected to be allowed back into major even if doesn't meet current GPA requirements for impacted majors. Departments are advisory in this area, and not final decision makers. If students reapply, suggested there should be paperwork to request as a returning student so that evaluation isn't so strict such that there is no accommodation for justifiable reasons.
- Medical Information for Leaves:
  - Medical leave is not able to be validated by reviewers because are not allowed to be privy to medical information. Form needs to be sent to doctor, and form only needs doctor name, license number, and if student should be allowed to drop or if certain accommodations are needed (not a full drop, but partial work for class completion). Form has some instruction that clarifies/differentiates activities that are permissible to be used to justify drop. Physician can use their discretion to explain what activities are ok/not ok due to illness/injury/etc.
  - Recommended that doctor's form have the student's request form attached so that the doctor allows an appropriate release based on class activities and not a blanket release.
  - Brooks requests that medical leave section call out both physical and mental so not stigmatizing mental health leaves. Wording to be changed to reflect this.
  - Parag. Under Categories of leaves of absence "although details of the medical condition or the type of healthcare professional consulted should not be included, only that there is a medical condition that justifies the leave is supported by a State-certified healthcare professional's authorization with respect to both the severity of the medical condition and the period of need for a leave, as given by means of the Healthcare Professional's Verification of Medical Condition Form" to be moved below Primary caregiver leaves

paragraph, indented and added “for medical and primary caregiver leaves:”

- Clarification that professors are permitted to request a note for a medical excuse in a class, though it doesn't need to have details, just saying that was under care for such and such dates. Specify that do NOT have to include details.
- First semester leaves of absence:
  - Bruck says first semester leaves of absence are allowed and CSU system wants SJSU to formulate a campus policy for them;
  - Branz says currently most doing a rolling over of application to next semester. Don't grant leave of absence for first semesters, but under rare circumstances admission may be deferred to another semester. Procedure is to apply in CSUmentor, wait until accepted so are matriculated student, then request leave, not request before accepted into program because no record of deferral and no one to monitor it.
  - Branz clarifies that if first semester leave granted, cohort programs or remedial students are messed up, so student has to take a full year essentially.
- International students:
  - Communicated to students that “other restriction such as in the ability to work within the US may be imposed by federal immigration regulations. International law Allows for medical leave without penalizing for presence in US. Lack of enrollment sentence clarifies that any other reason besides severe medical must leave the US. Language of paragraph to be clarified by Stef for next meeting.
- In response to new section added by Bruck in cohort programs:
  - Question as to how to enforce cohorts. Brooks says with prerequisites, and that wording implies department or college decision, though not really a decision at those levels. Restricted by the nature or structure of the program. Reword “academic cohort may be restricted by the structure of their academic programs regarding the duration of their leaves” so that it implies that those who need a semester may be required to take a full year. Stef will reword for next meeting.
- Process Paragraph:
  - Changed in language so that it will not go to senate committee. “for first-semester, retroactive and educational leaves or in cases in which the registrar determines that a university review is needed, the petition will be forwarded for ultimate decision to the leave of absence committee consisting of the associate vice president of student academic success services, the associate dean of undergraduate studies and the associate dean of graduate studies or their designees.”
- Chair Frazier going to work on Leave of Absence document based on commentary, has notes and will bring back to ISA in February.

### Greensheet Modification Request:

- Complaints relating to the current greensheets:
  - Too long to read
  - Constantly changing
    - Many recent changes are due to poor wording, rather than content changes.
  - Linking to older versions when searched
  - Template is gigantic and new policies added haven't eliminated old policies included previously.
  - Question by WASC as to whether objectives and learning outcomes have been provided to students, which are required.
  - Brooks states most issues with Student Fairness Committee are related to confusion with professors on greensheet and that they either haven't read it all or don't understand it all.
    - Recommends document for instructors so they can understand what is needed and why so reduce student complaints about course.
- Suggestions to improve greensheets
  - Branz suggests that a cleaner way to do it is to have a default form with working links for instructors. Also suggests that greensheet information be available to all students, not just enrolled students so that students can make informed decisions. Concern more with archiving rather than content.
    - Kelley reminded that some of the information is mandated and must be "easily accessible." Requirements change when senate makes new policies or federal laws change.
  - Daniels argues most content is irrelevant to him, including objectives; suggests only putting most relevant info related to course in document.
  - Branz recommends dividing syllabus into 3 sections to specify what is course-specific and what is policy: 1) Learning Outcomes and Course Content; 2) Assignments and Grading; 3) Campus Resources and Policies. Recommends link content in last category to simplify document.
    - Brooks recommends dividing category 3 into 2 separate categories: 3a) Resources and 3b) Policies.
- Questions whether links are sufficient or if summative paragraphs are required in greensheet.
  - Feist recommends just linking;
  - Sullivan-Green suggests that emphasis needs to be made in the greensheet that students are responsible for understanding policies.
  - Sullivan-Green also questions whether comment in original request that "most material would be placed on a learning management system" is actually true for most instructors, putting into question the whole idea of linking content being readily available to all students.

**San Jose State University**  
**Instruction & Student Affairs Committee**  
**Meeting of 2015-01-26, 2-4 pm**  
**Clark Hall 412**  
**AGENDA**  
*Scribe: Bill Campsey*

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

1. Approval of minutes of 11-24
2. Leave of absence draft policy
3. Credit by exam draft policy
4. Academic integrity – policy revision. (Draft is very rough right now.)
5. Adjournment

*Items for future consideration:*

- *Amend / revise S10-6*

# Minutes from ISA Meeting

January 26, 2015

Scribe: B. J. Campsey

*In attendance:* Looloo Amante, Steve Branz (non-voting), Demerris Brooks, David Bruck (non-voting), Bill Campsey, Stefan Frazier (Chair), Greg Feist, Victor Hernandez, Monika Kress, Ashlei McPherson, Aaron Miller, Marian Sofish, and Laura Sullivan-Green

Minutes from November 24, 2014 were approved 10 Affirmative, 0 Negative, and 1 + 1 Abstentions

*Introduction of new members* – Aaron Miller and Ashlei McPherson new student members of the Committee. Mr. Miller replaces AS President Gary Daniels and Ms. McPherson fills an open seat for AS Director - Student Resource Affairs. Mr. Miller has been officially added to the Committee, but Ms. McPherson has not. Therefore her votes will be noted but not included in the official count. *After the meeting, the Chair confirmed that Ms. McPherson was actually confirmed for the committee, so her votes were indeed counted.*

## **Leave of Absence Policy – Preparation for First Reading**

Chair Frazier reminded the Committee that since our review of the policy is for a first reading only, the purpose is not perfection but to ready the policy for Senate input. Greater specificity will be required after the Senate's reaction to the proposed policy is received.

Existing leave of absence practices are vague and restrictive. They mainly exist as procedures rather than policy. Since standard procedures are not policy, the purpose of the proposed policy is to codify these procedures.

Specific issues regarding the categories of leaves of absence were discussed. It was determined that medical leaves should refer to mental as well as physical health issues. A great deal of discussion was given to whether E.O. 665 Leaves should be included as a category, since this type of leave is imposed rather than granted. After much debate, it was decided to include this as one of the categories of leaves of absence. The period for retroactive leaves of absence was also debated. It was determined that a limiting period of two years should be included in the proposed policy.

The motion to approve the policy was moved by Gregory Feist and seconded by Victor Hernandez.

9 + 1 Affirmative, 0 Negative, 1 Abstention

## **Credit by Examination Policy**

Chair Frazier explained that SJSU had adopted practices on campus that were not codified neither were they in line with procedures of other CSU campuses nor with guidelines from the Chancellors office. Again, we were admonished to allow the Senate to make suggestions regarding the policy rather than seeking to perfect a policy before the first reading.

The committee first reviewed the existing credit by examination procedures as referenced in the University Catalogue. Discussion and questions centered on the collection of fees for the examination and whether graduate students can challenge undergraduate courses in their proscribed programs.

The motion to approve the policy draft was made by Aaron Miller and seconded by Victor Hernandez.

9 + 1 Affirmative, 0 Negative, 1 Abstention

A procedural question was then posed. Should the proposed policy be presented first to the Senate or the UCCD (University Committee of Chairs and Directors)?

### **Academic Integrity**

It was agreed that our discussion of Academic Integrity was early and that it was presented to allow the Committee to begin to consider its implications and ramifications.

At present, the Committee on Student Conduct and Ethical Development (SCED) can only suggest a grade change if students accused of academic misconduct we found to be not guilty of the accusation. It was noted that the CSU and Ed Code allow – even mandate – the grade to be changed.

The discussion centered on the chain of command that would evaluate a grade review. Specifically, what is the role and responsibility of the Committee on Student Conduct and Ethical Development (SCED) versus the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR). The Committee agreed to continue to discuss exactly what the campus policy should be to both protect academic freedom and student's rights.

It was agreed to invite the Director of SCED, Shannon Quihuiz, to the next meeting to present university data related to that office and to help in discussion.

Motion to Adjourn at 3:59pm. No vote was taken as everyone had sprinted for the door.

**San Jose State University**  
**Instruction & Student Affairs Committee**  
**Meeting of 2015-02-02, 2-4 pm**  
**Clark Hall 412**  
**AGENDA**  
***Scribe: Aaron Miller***

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

1. Approval of minutes of 01-26
2. Academic integrity – policy revision. Guest – Shannon Quihuiz, OSCED
3. Probation and disqualification – policy revision
4. Adjournment

*Items for future consideration:*

- *None right now.*



## ISA Minutes- 2/2/14

**Attendance:** Stefan Frazier, Bill Campsey, Aaron Miller, Marian Sofish, Sheryl Walters, Lourdes Amante, Victor Hernandez, Demerris Brooks, Matt Rees, Yu-Ping Huang, Monika Kress, Greg Feist, Ashley McPherson, David Bruck

### **I. Approval or prior minutes**

There were no minutes from 1/26 yet to approve

### **II. Academic Integrity**

Student Conduct and Ethical Development (SCED) Director, Shannon Quihuiz, provided statistics on Academic integrity at SJSU from Fall 2014 in various forms. Highest number of reporting rates came from units with better mechanisms, e.g., Turnitin.com, and certain classes with specific ways of simplifying reporting. Shannon Quihuiz provided specific answers to questions about the data and what the current policies and processes are including administrative and academic sanctions. "Failure on the Evaluation instrument" was most used sanction, then "request for no additional sanctions," then "failure in the course" and "oral reprimand." The student conduct process is governed by CSU with policies and ultimately students could be expelled from the entire CSU. Accountability and education go hand in hand in the conduct office; i.e. students will be disciplined as well as educated in integrity issues.

Currently students do not have recourse to dispute grades that are said to have violated academic integrity. Apparently, our university opted to make academic sanctions indisputable for students. EO 1037 was referenced for a question about appeals. It was noted that according to that EO our campus has been in violation for not having an entity for students to go to for recourse. It was noted by the representative from Undergraduate Studies that a rule of thumb was that when policies are ambiguous than it should be ruled in favor of the student. Another EO was referenced that appeared to provide a loophole that enabled our campus to opt to make AI violations indisputable, in a sense. Plagiarism was discussed as one of the aspects of academic integrity that are applied very inconsistently in part because plagiarism itself is defined very broadly, and difficult to define.

The degree of necessity faculty to report was discussed. Shannon Quihuiz discussed how her office, with Housing, has developed other behavioral rubrics and standardized guidelines for disciplinary action. The Registrar discussed her experiences in over the years. The committee discussed the workload implications for the conduct office if all infractions were referred and reviewed and the perception amongst faculty and students. The specific policy proposal was discussed briefly but it was determined that the committee would discuss the specific provisions at the next ISA meeting.

### **II. Probation and Disqualification**

Undergrad Studies (Steve) gave some history to the procedures over the years in regards to this proposed policy. The committee discussed what the implications were of freshmen being able to have a consecutive semester of 1.50-1.99. It was determined that the definition of good standing has not changed over the years and has stayed at 2.0. The crux of the conversation centered on the implications of a term GPA or SJSU cumulative GPA. Then we discussed comments on the policy proposal made by the Chair in relation to graduate and undergraduate students and the application of this policy to them.

Closing comments about upcoming Senate and ISA meetings were made.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:59 pm

**San Jose State University**  
**Instruction & Student Affairs Committee**  
**Meeting of 2015-02-16, 2-4 pm**  
**Clark Hall 412**  
**AGENDA**  
*Scribe: Matthew Rees*

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

1. Approval of minutes of 01-26 and 02-02
2. Leave of absence policy – back from first reading
3. Credit by Exam policy – back from first reading
4. Probation / disqualification policy (a few questions on draft yet unanswered; and David, were you going to add a section or something?)
5. Academic integrity policy
6. Adjournment

*Items for future consideration:*

- *All the things above that we didn't get to, plus more.*

**Instruction & Student Affairs Committee**  
**Meeting of 2015-02-16, 2pm to 4pm**  
**Clark 412**  
**MINUTES**  
*Scribe: Matthew Rees*

**Attendance:** Stefan Frazier, Aaron Miller, Laura Sullivan-Green, Ashlei McPherson, Rich Kelley, Sheryl Walters, David Bruck, Monika Kress, Yu-Ping Huang, Victor Hernandez, LooLoo Amante, Steven Branz

**I. Minutes from 2015-02-26 Meeting**

Minutes were reviewed and approved unanimously with two abstentions.

**II. Minutes from 2015-02-02 Meeting**

Minutes were reviewed. A few revisions were made. These included clarification regarding "coding," the role of the Office of Student Conduct and Ethical Development and it serving both disciplinary and educational roles, and how Housing and the Office of Student Conduct and Ethical Development have developed specific enforcement guidelines and standards for certain alleged policy violations. The minutes were approved unanimously.

**III. Leave of Absence (LOA) Policy**

Two general questions were asked by the Senate: What problem is this meant to fix and if there's already a procedure, why set a limit? The committee agreed that the policy provides an opportunity for faculty to set policy. It also creates a written standard, makes it easier for transition and provides codification. There is an ad hoc committee addressing such issues however it meets only as needed.

There was discussion regarding language in the LOA policy regarding "course expiration." The issues raised included concerns about the course material and it being outdated and its relevancy once a student returns from their LOA. Can the standard vary by department and/or discipline? Also, how do you balance allowing for degree completion versus ensuring the relevancy of the course material that was completed? D. Bruck shared that the 10 year course expiration for undergraduate students, as per long-standing SJSU practices, is not frequently enforced, and that it's more prevalent with Graduate course expiration of 7 years.

The committee unanimously agreed to recommend that the old language be removed and the new language drafted by Stef be added.

D. Bruck shared that at the University Council of Chairs meeting, the question was raised as to whether the students on leave count would impact admit numbers. They are awaiting a response from Marna Genes on this. There were also questions about medical leave and the new restrictions which limit the amount of information faculty are able to know.

MSP on Leave of Absence policy proposal, 11-0-0

**III. Credit By Exam Policy**

The policy is still pending and there weren't too many questions at Academic Senate. However, there was discussion regarding waiver exams and challenge exams. The current policy grants unit credit for waiver and challenge exams. A number of points were raised by ISA in support of and with concerns

about the policy. These included weighing the benefits of the classroom experience versus the expediency of earning unit credits by exam. How would this impact department funding and also FTES? Allowing credit by exam would lower costs for students and move students to graduation at a quicker rate. It would also create more classroom space and allow the campus to serve more students. There is a philosophical component in that the policy makes a statement about the value placed on learning inside the classroom. What would be the impact on the overall college experience for students? There was also discussion regarding the workload in high school AP courses versus college Gen Ed coursework and comparison of the level of academic rigor. Would the policy only apply to Gen Ed courses but not major courses? Ultimately it was agreed that this is a curricular matter rather than a procedural one, and that the policy will require further discussion.

#### **IV. Probation/Disqualification Policy**

The policy is still not finished. There is a set of academic guidelines regarding academic probation and disqualification that didn't go through the formal review process. Current university policies are not incorporated into the draft and need to be added. The additions will be added to ISA's draft which D. Bruck will review and provide to the committee at a future meeting.

There was discussion about changing the GPA cumulative and GPA term language in the policy. Stef will email Dora about the feasibility of the change. Also, there is a preference to do a general revision to the full document rather than a few minor edits.

#### **V. Academic Integrity**

The latest version of the policy was reviewed. There was some discussion about the use of "oral reprimand." It was decided to keep it in the document. The header for 4.0 was changed back to "Reporting and Evaluation." There was also discussion about "plagiarism" and its complexities in terms of definition and how it is understood by students. ISA will continue reviewing the policy at the next meeting. A suggestion was made to have the policy reviewed by additional faculty before it is submitted to the Academic Senate.

**Meeting was adjourned at 3:57pm**

**San Jose State University**  
**Instruction & Student Affairs Committee**  
**Meeting of 2015-02-23, 2-4 pm**  
**Clark Hall 412**  
**AGENDA**  
*Scribe: Rich Kelley*

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

1. Approval of minutes of 02-16
2. Academic Integrity draft policy
3. Probation and DQ – policy amendment
4. Credit by Exam
5. Adjournment

*Items for future consideration:*

- *All the things above that we didn't get to, plus more.*

**San José State University**  
**Instruction and Student Affairs (ISA) Committee**  
**Minutes of meeting of February 23, 2015**  
**2:00–4:00 p.m., Clark 412**  
*Scribe: Richard C. Kelley*

***Call to Order:*** 2:03 p.m.

***Attendance:*** Stefan Frazier, Marian Sofish, Sheryl Walters, Looloo Amante, Demerris Brooks, David Bruck, Richard C. Kelley, Monika Kress, Gregory Feist, Ashlei McPherson, Aaron Miller, Victor Hernandez, Yu-Ping Huang, Laura Sullivan-Green and Stephen Branz

**I. Approval of Minutes of February 16, 2015**

- a. Minutes from previous meeting noted they were approved unanimously, but Sheryl Walters requested adding “with 2 abstentions”
- b. Moved–Rich Kelley, Second–Gregory Feist
- c. Approved unanimously with 4 abstentions

**II. Academic Integrity draft policy (*first reading*)**

- d. *David Bruck*—order change of Evaluating & Reporting first, Sanctions second (made by Stefan), David suggested moving it back because from a Senate perspective and ease of use, original order is preferred. Discussion ensued on: Should findings and/or sanctions be reviewed by Student Conduct and Ethical Development (SCED)?
- e. *Stefan Frazier*—first reads are for feedback, predicts there will be critical feedback. Discussed referrals to BAFPR (Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility). Reference to S94-5 (section 4 by Victor Hernandez), may be encroaching on academic freedom. Section 5.4 of the draft, what happens when the instructor refuses to lift a sanction....reference EO1037. Does the department chair or other professor make the change? After reporting, what happens to the report/findings? How much authority and autonomy should the instructor have?
- f. *Demerris Brooks*—add plagiarism compliance services, FERPA compliance, accessibility, etc. Favors a parallel process that doesn’t require additional intervention or steps for students. Sent Stefan additional language from S07-6. Support for having SCED review findings and sanctions. Faculty can’t go back after findings to revise sanctions,

must be done up front. SCED will determine if they will apply additional administrative sanctions.

- g. *Ashlei McPherson and Aaron Miller*—shouldn't some of this language be included in the greensheet? Shouldn't it be a practice anyway, that everything be reviewed departmentally? Support for SCED review, not sure if policy or process are clear. Trying to bring academic and administrative processes in line with each other. If a student misses a conference with an instructor regarding a cheating or plagiarism allegation, can the sanction be imposed regardless....ie skipping vs. rescheduling due to unforeseen reason?
- h. *Marian Sofish*—reminder regarding specific paperwork and policy. Doesn't believe it's the role of the instructor to apply a sanction, it belongs with SCED. Discussed the educational aspects of SCED process.
- i. Additional robust conversation involving most of the committee! Serious concerns raised regarding whether SCED would or should be able to over-rule the wishes of a faculty member. Second version of policy draft seems to be preferred (over first).

### **III. Probation and Disqualification policy amendment**

- a. *Marian Sofish*—questions regarding proposed revisions. Faculty has prerogative to make exceptions! Believes current policy is working. Referenced asking Dora Ozawa to run a report with a "data dump" for historical perspective. Would rather go the "safe" way.
- b. *Stefan Frazier*—substantive change includes "Term GPA" to "SJSU Cum GPA".
- c. *Steve Branz*—supports change referenced by Stefan Frazier. Does not believe policy is currently working. Wants to revert to what it was before (S10-4), implement it the way the policy was intended.
- d. Moved—Looloo Amante, Second—Ashlei McPherson
- e. Approved unanimously with 1 abstention

### **IV. Credit by Exam: referral transferred to Curriculum & Research Committee**

### **V. Adjournment: 3:49 p.m.**



**San Jose State University**  
**Instruction & Student Affairs Committee**  
**Meeting of 2015-03-09, 2-4 pm**  
**Clark Hall 412**

**AGENDA**

*Scribe: Yu-Ping Huang*

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

1. Approval of minutes of 02-23
2. Probation and DQ – prepare for final reading
3. Academic integrity policy draft – prepare for first reading (I think we're nearly there ... )
4. Instructor drops in online courses – see referral – brainstorming
5. Class cancellations – policy to be prepared
6. Adjournment

*Items for future consideration:*

- *All the things above that we didn't get to, plus more.*

**San José State University**  
**Instruction and Student Affairs (ISA) Committee**  
**Minutes of meeting of March 9, 2015**  
**2:00–4:00 p.m., Clark 412**  
*Scribe: Yu-Ping Huang*

**Call to Order:** 2:03 p.m.

**Attendance:** Aaron Miller, Ashlei McPherson, David Bruck, Gregory Feist, Laura Sullivan-Green, Marian Sofish, Matthew Rees, Monika Kress, Sheryl Walters, Stefan Frazier, and Yu-Ping Huang

**I. Approval of Minutes of February 23, 2015**

- a. The minutes of February 23, 2015 were approved unanimously with 1 abstention.

**II. Probation and DQ – prepare for final reading**

- a. The policy S10-6 on Academic Standards: Probation and Disqualification was reviewed briefly at previous Senate meeting. No questions were asked then, so the committee approved the final version unanimously for final reading.

**III. Academic Integrity Policy**

- a. Discussed the rationale behind the policy which is to highlight the need for faculty members to report all instances of academic misconduct and provide students with a comparable avenue of appeal.
- b. Section 4.4 was discussed extensively, including 1) the possibly strong reaction from others in the Senate due to the report requirement (e.g., “After this initial report, no additional academic sanctions may be levied”), 2) the purpose and use of oral reprimand as one of the recommended academic sanctions in relation to the report requirement, and 3) enforcement of the policy. After further deliberation, there was a motion to add a sentence to clarify the language under Section 4.4: “Should the faculty member neglect to file an appropriate report to SCED, any academic sanction imposed is invalid until the report is filed.” The motion was seconded by Aaron Miller and then moved to further discussion and voting. The voting results were 9 approved, 1 opposed, and 1 abstained. The sentence was thus added.
- c. In Section 5.3, confusion about S94-5 and S99-9 was discussed and clarified. A sentence was added: “This section 5.3 thereby represents an exception to University Policy S99-9.”

- d. Section 5.4 was discussed. In particular, a question was asked about the timeline of the report (e.g., a semester long?) and the possible impact of the time taken to finish a report (e.g., delayed graduation?)
- e. Given that the policy will be forwarded to Senate for the first reading, it is expected to receive further feedback.

**IV. Instructor Drop Dates for Online Courses**

- a. Discussed a policy proposal developed by the Undergraduate Studies Committee regarding the instructor drop dates for online courses. The rationale behind the policy was discussed such as making space for other students who are waiting. Reviewed various mechanisms that can help instructors make a decision in terms of dropping student enrollments. The possible mechanisms included 1) having a first assignment due by a certain date, 2) logging in on Canvas within the first two weeks, 3) responding to instructor contact (e.g., email, web communication).
- b. Some discussion questions entailed the timeline of dropping student involvement (e.g., the same as in-person courses?) and the expectation of social interaction among instructor and peers in online courses.
- c. Stefan Frazier will develop a draft of the policy for further discussion in the near future.

**V. Class Cancellations**

- a. Discussed a possible policy based on a memo from Dennis Jaehne, AVP of Graduate and Undergraduate Program. Discussed current issues regarding class cancellation such as courses being cancelled too early, too late, or closed pre-maturely and the impacts on students.
- b. Given that the policy may involve more than notifying students in time (e.g., priority registration, exceptional registration), further clarification of the original memo is needed before forming a policy around class cancellations.

**VI. Adjournment: 3:45 p.m.**

**San Jose State University**  
**Instruction & Student Affairs Committee**  
**Meeting of 2015-03-16, 2-4 pm**  
**Clark Hall 412**  
**AGENDA**  
*Scribe: Steve Branz*

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

1. Approval of minutes of 03-09
2. Class cancellations – revising a version of the old draft policy
3. Instructor drops in online courses. Sigh. It's another one of these situations where there are two previous policies, one of which appears to replace the other but is noted merely as "modifies." Clearly, past ISA chairs weren't thinking of poor Stef.

Meanwhile, though, let's continue with the principles: how should students "establish a committed presence" in an online course to avoid being dropped?

4. Adjournment

*Items for future consideration:*

- *All the things above that we didn't get to, plus more.*

San Jose State University  
Instruction & Student Affairs Committee  
March 16, 2015, 2 pm to 4 pm  
Clark Hall 412  
*Scribe: Demerris Brooks*

Call to order: 2:05

Attendance: Sheryl Walters, Bill Campsey, Ashleigh McPherson, Yu-Ping Huang, Laura Sullivan-Green, Greg Feist, Monika Kress, David Bruck, Demerris Brooks, Victor Hernandez, Stefan Frazier, Aaron Miller.

1. Meeting Minutes: March 9, 2015—Approved: 6-0-3
2. Course section cancellations.
  - a. UCCD passed a resolution in 2012/2013 that is incorporated into sections 1 and 2 of the current draft policy. Section 3 is intended to address the instances in which courses have been cancelled far too late (i.e., 3-4 weeks into the semester), causing problems for student-athlete eligibility and full time enrollment for FA.
  - b. The course registration period is now much longer than it was, but the problem of late cancellation continues.
  - c. The dates used in the policy should be consistent with the language from the CFA contract which identifies the date by which a course must be cancelled in order not to pay the instructor for the semester.
  - d. Do we really want to say that courses will not be cancelled after a certain date under any circumstances? There have been instances when an instructor has died mid-semester. The statement should be modified to allow for some, although rare, flexibility.
  - e. If this problem has been heavily curtailed can we delete sections 1 and 2 and focus the discussion on 3?
  - f. Does that language about allowable substitutions need to be clarified? Are courses outside of the department acceptable?
  - g. In most cases the Chair takes over when there is no replacement found. Should that be put into the policy? Chairs are not qualified to teach all of the courses in their department. What is the remedy in those extreme circumstances?
  - h. Should it be written that there is a date in the semester at which the course may not be cancelled and that a grade must be assigned (i.e., after X week in the semester)? The policy could set timelines for the point in the semester at which independent study should be assigned or someone is required to take over teaching the class. Under-enrolled courses had previously been cancelled and the students forced to enroll in IS but the instructor wasn't paid for the IS students.
  - i. Are we getting too specific? Are we adding details that we will not be able to address? These situations generally take care of themselves.
  - j. The focus needs to be on not cancelling the class. The original intent was to allow classes to meet and have an opportunity to recruit students and fill the class before it is cancelled. When is the ideal time to notify students that a class will be cancelled? The intent of section 1 is to assure that the class will meet on the first day in order to provide graduating Seniors the opportunity to add the class.
  - k. Section 1, items A and B, come directly from the UCCD recommendations. Are these still necessary given the change to a longer registration period? It was suggested that we remove section 1 and keep section 2, but section 1 is the language from the referral and the reason that the issue was referred to ISA in the first place.

- l. It was suggested that the timelines in items 1 and 2 be switched. The concern, however, was that the switch complicates the situation by structuring the policy in a way in which sections 2 and 3 contradict section 1.
- m. The University has to commit to the students and that is why the cancellation deadline has to be sooner than later. But is that before or after the beginning of the semester? If everyone is permitted to sign up at the last minute, there is no incentive to sign-up early. The purpose of the proposal was for courses to stay open until the first day of classes to allow an opportunity to fill them, but courses are under enrolled because students don't commit early enough. Students add late for a variety of reasons.
- n. Should we separate the two issues next time we discuss it? Future discussion should focus on late cancellations (after the add date) and what to do with stranded students.

### 3. Online Course Drops

- a. The "Last Day to Add" is not really the last day to add because we allow both late and retroactive adding of courses.
- b. We have generated a list of ways by which a student can establish a committed presence in an online class. Do we need any additional options?
- c. The "Last day to Add" is important context. We will add this language to the existing policy and review it at the next meeting.

**San Jose State University**  
**Instruction & Student Affairs Committee**  
**Meeting of 2015-04-13, 2-4 pm**  
**Clark Hall 412**

**AGENDA**

*Scribe: still looking! anyone? I'll be writing to someone individually soon ...*

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

1. Approval of minutes of 03-16
2. Update on academic integrity policy
3. Amending the drop and "W" policy (instructor drops)
4. No classes or exams on study days
5. Adjournment

*Items for future consideration:*

- *All the things above that we didn't get to, plus more.*

Minutes April 13, 2015  
ISA

Call to order: 2:07pm

Present: Frazer, Sofish, Walters, Rees, Hernandez, Campsey, Bruck, Huang,  
Late: Ashley, Amante, Kress,

1. Approval of minutes of 03-16: approved: 6-0-2
2. Update on academic integrity policy
  - Put on agenda for next Senate meeting but may ask for deferral if it only gets 20 min or so; even if pushed to new year
  - But should perhaps move to next AY given the turnover of the Senate; forfeit to next AY
  - But need to check if it is on agenda and whether it can be taken off
3. Amending the drop and “W” policy (instructor drops)
  - What to do in online courses for drop?
  - Revisit whole policy and clean up language in old policy
  - One amendment 2b (online) but other little things to be looked at and we now agree with the criteria (e.g. completing a class assignment, informing instructor...)
  - 2c: exceptions to last day: confusing about what exceptions clause means so discussed how to clarify it. First, need to make exceptions its own bullet point since it is both add and drop; clarified language about courses that have not yet been opened prior to 14<sup>th</sup> day of instruction.
  - Section 6: administrator appointed by President to oversee Ws; who is this individual now? Actually, this is wrong: it is simply the oversight of the AARS and GS&R. But Stef needs to check on this and get back to it next week. Actually, just change it to “appoint one or more individuals”.
  - Section 7: AARS not AS

Approved: 11-0-0

4. No classes or exams on study/dead days: to rescind S06-4
  - Final exams cannot be given on last day of class in lieu of on Final day
  - Final exams cannot be given on dead day
  - Monika wants to be able to have case-by-case exceptions if the final really creates serious hardships; so we are changing it to: **No classes or exams can be required** on the one day per semester listed on the official SJSU calendar as a “Study Day.”
  - Bring it back next week
5. Adjournment: 3:38pm



**San Jose State University  
Instruction & Student Affairs Committee  
Meeting of 2015-04-20, 2-4 pm  
Clark Hall 412**

**AGENDA**

*Scribe: David Bruck*

***YET INCOMPLETE***

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

1. Approval of minutes of 04-13
2. Update on academic integrity policy
3. No classes or exams on study days
4. Adjournment

*Items for future consideration:*

- *All the things above that we didn't get to, plus more.*

## ISA Meeting Minutes

April 20, 2015

Present: Sheryl Walters, Demerris Brooks, Victor Henandez, Monika Kress, Greg Feist, Rich Kelley, Aaron Miller, Laura Sullivan-Green, Bill Campsey, Yu-Ping Huang, Lou Lou Amante, Stef Frazier (Fearless Leader), David Bruck (scribe)

Absent: Steve Branz, Marian Sofish

1. Approval of Minutes of Apr 13: Approved 6-0-3

2. Update on Academic Integrity Policy. Held off until next year's Academic Senate (AS) agenda; removed from next week's. Online Drop Policy first reading next week in AS but last on schedule so unlikely to be considered. RTP Policy coming back as three separate policies: originally 40 pages. Library Policy to AS also.

3. Study Days/Final Exams (existing policy S06-4 about 10 years old)

a. Exceptions by dean always existed. Do we want to expand this or specify steps/process in this regard and with Provost's role to negotiate solution if faculty and students do not agree? No. But did include dean in hierarchy of solution making.

b. Define Study Day as "Dead Day" in Background.

c. No classes or exams on Study Day but changed to none can be required. Students may wish to leave town early and this would allow them to take exam earlier if instructor agrees.

d. Make wording inclusive of possibility of there being a second Study Day.

e. "Final examinations may be rescheduled" has ambiguity. Can a prof allow a student to take the exam early on Dead Day if both agree? Does seem to be allowed now, as we wish it to be. Made clearer by wording change to "A student may request an individual exam rescheduling" in place of the original wording. Can an entire class request an earlier exam date? No.

f. If passed now, likelihood for hearing this year in AS very low. 12-0-0 approval.