

## 2016-2017 Year-End Committee Report Form

**Committee:** Instruction and Student Affairs

**Chair:** Michael Kaufman

**Chair-Elect for 2017-2018:** TBD

**Number of Meeting held:** 15

(Please include phone/zip/email if available)

### Items of Business Completed 2016/2017

1. S17-1: Final exam/culminating activities policy.
2. S17-5: Required enrollment for culminating graduate students
3. S17-7: Graduate course revalidation
4. AS1650: Undergraduate Honors (passed by Senate, not yet signed)
5. AS1649: Priority registration (passed by Senate, not yet signed)

### Unfinished Business Items from 2016/2017

1. ISA-F15-6: Modification of F08-2, perhaps allowing repeaters to register before first day of class
2. From GUP/Wendy Ng: Guidelines for granting of Posthumous degrees and certificates.
3. ISA-F15-2: Guidelines for using adding codes after the start of the semester

### New Business Items for 2017/2018

1. Ask for reports from Student Fairness Committee regarding number, types and outcomes of the cases they see
2. Referral: does S14-3 (Student Fairness Dispute Resolution) conflict with EO1098?
- 3.

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

**Instruction and Student Affairs Committee  
Minutes for August 29, 2016**

**Present:**

Bruck, Campsey, Kaufman (Chair), Khan, Nash, Ng, Perea, Rees, Sen, Spica, Sullivan-Green, Medina Torres, Trousdale, Walters, Whyte, Wilson, and Yao (Sofish), Medina

**Absent:**

Aguilar, Miller and Torres-Mendoza

**Scribe:**

Campsey

**Call to Order:**

2:05pm, M. L. King Library Room 255

**Minutes:**

As it was the first meeting of the academic year, no minutes from a prior meeting were presented

*Since it was the first meeting of the year, Chair Kaufman indicated that the meeting would be informational in nature as opposed to the usual debate over referrals from the Executive Committee.*

*The meeting proceeded as follows:*

- Self-introduction of each committee member
- Explanation of information dissemination process through Google Docs
- \* Minute taking assignments were self-assigned for the year

*Chair Kaufman explained the inner working of the SJSU Academic Senate process*

- Senate membership and committee structure – available on the Senate website and on the committee drive
- Administrative Flow Chart of the Senate Policy process – available on the Senate website and on the committee drive
- The charge for the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee described and the standing committees reporting to the I & SA Committee were identified
- The status of referrals to the I & SA committee, finished, deferred, and pending, was reviewed by Chair Kaufman

Due to University sponsored travel plans by the Chair, the status of the scheduled meeting on September 12<sup>th</sup> is uncertain. An announcement to the Committee will be forthcoming.

**Adjournment**

3:02pm

**Instruction and Student Affairs Committee  
Minutes for September 12, 2016**

**Present:**

Khan, Ng, Bruck, Sen, Miller, Yao, Sullivan-Green, Medina Torres, Spica, Perea, Whyte, Wilson, Campsey, Walters

**Absent:**

Aguilar, Kaufman, Nash, Trousdale, and Rees

**Scribe:**

Walters

**Call to Order:**

2:00 PM, ML King Library Room 255

**Minutes:**

Minutes of the August 29, 2016 were corrected to include Whyte as being present. Minutes approved as corrected.

Continued discussion to amend the list of students receiving priority registration. EOP students were never intended to be on this list. Committee voted to remove EOP students from the list of students receiving priority registration. Vote: 11 Yes and 0 No.

Discussion concerning the requirement of graduate students enrolling for one unit of 1290 every semester after all course work is completed until the thesis, culminating experience, project or final examinations are done. This unit now costs \$280 instead of \$4000 for regular registration. There will now be three different 1290 courses, R, S, and T costing \$280, \$500, or \$1000 depending on their major and how much faculty time is required to get the student finished. The department will receive a portion of this fee and will determine which 1290 course is given. David Bruck will bring templates and other changes to our next meeting.

Discussion of the Student Fairness Committee: Annual report of activities has not been submitted to ISA for the past two years. The Ombudsman should come to the ISA Committee.

**Adjournment**

2:56 PM

**Instruction and Student Affairs Committee  
Minutes for October 3, 2016**

**Present:** Khan, Simpson, Miller, Spica, Medina Torres, Kinney, Ng, Walters, Whyte, Kaufman, Sullivan-Green, Nash, Wilson

**Absent:**

Bruck, Sen, Yao, Perea, Campsey, Aguilar, Trousdale, Mendoza-Torres

**Scribe:**

Medina Torres

**Call to Order:**

2:06pm, Clark 412

**Minutes:**

Minutes for September 12<sup>th</sup>, 2016 approved

1. Update on Priority Registration list, EOP Students have been removed.
2. Continued discussion on the referral on mandatory graduate enrollment
  - Alumni Representative: What if each course has an assigned amount of money?
  - Chair stated, the Provost has the authority to set amount charged for these new courses.
  - Spica: It's very expensive to be a student. I would not like to pay more for a course like this.
  - Jenny: What about all the associated fees?
  - The concern of the committee is how much money will be coming back to the departments? Who would be in charge of placing these justifications? How many students will be benefiting from this? Are our faculty being compensated enough for the extra time spent with students to help them earn their credit?
  - Chair: Closes discussion because of the absence of Associate Dean of Graduate Studies. Bruck will be working on revisions for the referral.

*The top three questions of this discussion were the following: How does compensation work? Who sets compensation rate? How many students will be impacted?*

3. Referral regarding rescinding of F72-8
  - Chair explains Grade Distribution Reports. San Jose State University has not released a Grade Distribution Report, however, the committee reviews the format of a report by California State University, Los Angeles.
  - Khan: Do SOTES gave a list of grades? Chair responds: Yes, but these aren't public. Chairs of the Departments have access to see these lists, but there is no distribution.
  - Committee holds a lengthy discussion about RateMyProfessor.Com
  - Jack: If these reports were released, it would help San Jose State University provide transparency.
  - Committee discussed the purpose of the policy and how these distributions can be made accessible to students

- Chair: Bringing it to the Academic Senate may bring background information on this policy. Perhaps, updating it may be useful? How challenging will it be to gather all this information and provide a report?

*Motion: To pass this to Academic Senate and ask for information regarding original policy*

4. Referral: appropriate use of “Study/Conference Day: Final Exam policy

- Chair: Reviews the policy details and why the policy is enacted.
- Committee discusses the “Dead Days” experience, as Faculty struggle with meetings, Students struggle with not enough time to study and meet with professors.

*Students on Committee agreed to do research on the amount of Study Days provided at other California State University Campuses. Committee agreed to discuss the Referral at next meeting.*

5. Discussion of College of Engineering plan on Gateway Assignments

- Jinny Rhee, Associate Dean of Engineering presented a policy that will provide protection for Gateway Assignments.
- Committee discussed on multiple departments using a type of “Gateway Assignment” within their classes.
- Syllabus always states if classes contain these types of assignments.

*Committee reviewed the policy and recommended improvements, the referral will be brought back to committee and passed down to SFC for feedback about whether the proposal would be looked upon favorably in student appeals.*

## **Adjournment**

3:45 pm

Instruction & Student Affairs Committee (ISA)  
Minutes  
October 17, 2016  
2 pm, CL 412

Present: Campsey, Kaufman, Khan, Medina Torres, Miller, Nash, Ng, Perea, Saran, Sen, Simpson, Sofish, Spica, Trousdale, Wilson

Absent: Bruck, Green, Rees, Whyte

Meeting called to order, 2:03

1. Minutes approved, with correction that Miller was present
2. Continued discussion of referral on mandatory graduate enrollment

Three questions the committee had from last meeting:

- 1) Numbers of students that this will affect: 150 to 200 students per semester affected by this policy, out of 6-7 thousand grad students
- 2) The money generated by these three versions of the 1290 course comes from CIES (College of International and Extended Studies) directly to enrollments, with the special session formula set by them (approximately 1/3 of the tuition that the students pay
- 3) The decision making process for the tuition level: Departments make a decision that is forwarded onto the AVP of GUP. The Provost would set the price per unit.

Questions raised include students' being able to use financial aid for this one unit: yes, but need to be enrolled in 6 units (such as English 299 instead of one unit of 1290). The proposal should include a mechanism to insure that graduate students know their funding options (such as a TAship that would pay for up to 6 units), as well as clarity for departments on different levels of tuition costs across the university. It was noted that international students have to take 9 units a semester until they can petition for a lower load.

3. Continued discussion around rescinding F72-8

Background on the 1972 policy from Peter Buzanski (email attached to the minutes): distribution of grades in each individual class; so you could "see" how hard or easy the professor was.

Consultation with Scott Heil lead to the IEA site where grade distributions are available by class, but NOT broken down by section.

**Instruction & Student Affairs Committee**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**November 7, 2016**  
**Clark Hall 412**  
**2:00 – 4:00 PM**

**I. Call to order: 2:05**

**Present:** Bruck, Kaufman, Khan(scribe), Medina, Medrano, Miller, Ng, Perea, Sen, Simpson, Spica, Sullivan-Green, Trousdale, Walters, Wilson, Whyte

**II. Approval of minutes:**

The minutes of 10/17 were approved as written (13-0-3)

**III. Required Enrollment Policy for Culminating Graduate Students:**

Follow up discussion on mandatory graduate enrollment:

Bruck—for students this three-tiered system (1290R, 1290S, 1290T) of special session classes makes a monumental difference in what they pay; huge savings to them; allows those on financial aid to take regular classes, should they want to. For departments, what they receive in terms of special session fees will depend on each college. Most departments will probably stay in the lowest tier of the three-tiered system of special session classes.

Kaufman—Nearly all chairs consulted about this thought it was a good idea.

Miller—Should get grad student perspective on this. (No grad student was present at the meeting.)

Motion to vote on policy replacing F11-2

Motion approved: 12-0-2

**IV. Study/Conference Day:**

Continued discussion centered around this crucial question:

- Should culminating activity (perhaps a paper or project) be due during scheduled final exam time, even if that happens to be the last day of finals? This could lead to faculty not having enough time to grade the submission before grades are due.

Committee reached a general consensus that culminating activity not be due earlier than first day of finals.

Action item: Miller and Kaufman will re-draft language to include classes where culminating experience (such as a dance/music recital) may take more time than can be fit into 3 hours of exam time.

**V. Priority Registration:**

The California Promise Act (SB 412) requires revisiting F14-1. This Act stipulates that if a student signs the CA Promise that she/he will graduate in 4 years, they are guaranteed to do so. This creates a new category of students who

would receive priority registration. Committee must determine a priority registration policy but prior to that it needs to know how many would qualify for CA Promise.

Action item: Kaufman will consult with administrators, and, in particular, Deputy Provost Kemnitz.

**VI. Honors Task Force:**

Khan, Ng, Simpson and Spica (members of the Honors Task Force) provided an update on F96-5.

Outstanding items that need further discussion:

- Possible elimination of Honors at Entrance, since no student is awarded that.
- Honor Roll designation for President's and Dean's scholars based on one or two semester's work.
- Minimum required GPA for granting Honors.
- Recognition and privileges for all Honor recipients, including priority registration and priority housing.

**VII. Adjournment**—the meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm



Instruction & Students Affairs Committee (ISA)  
Minutes  
November 14, 2016  
2 pm, MLK 255

Present:

Absent:

Meeting called to order, 2:00pm

-Kaufman-summary of agenda from last week, No questions  
-Approval of minutes-approved unanimously w/ 1 abstention

### **Major business item today: Culminating Activity Policy**

-Kaufman- Miller and I met Thursday to go over policy, Reads from “culminating activity policy” draft:

‘Faculty members are required to have a culminating activity for their courses, which can include a final examination, a final research paper or project, a final creative work or performance, a final portfolio of work, or other appropriate assignments.’

Time Frame for Culminating activities section are from Humboldt state

Notable: exam must happen at scheduled time, specifies how students can

Last meeting, the sense of the room was that people thought culminating experiences or exams cannot be turned in on ‘study/dead day’, the day before the first day of finals

Discussion on proposed policy changes

Ng- Policy is not as student friendly as it can be.

How do we determine scheduled day?

Wilson- how would students be able to prove all these assignments are due the same day [if they have more than 2 exams on the same day]?

Ng- could require more work from students and faculty who are being asked to give accommodations already.

Miller- If a student has a lot due, goes to their instructors, requests a different day to turn it in

Ng- expresses concerns over all of the individual requests

Wilson- Instructors would ask for the students’ final schedule

Kaufman- This would have to be included on the syllabus b/c it specifies [what a student should do if they have too many exams on one day]

Ng- brought up ‘turn around time’

Kaufman- Paper could take longer than grading final exam.

Deanna-students’ thoughts?

Hector-refers to exceptions if there are 3 or more exams. In the Humboldt policy, does it specify in syllabus. If it’s clear then it’s okay.

Kaufman- You could have more people with overlapping assignments if this is changed.

Don’t want to create a mess where students have 3 papers due on the same day

Simpson- for graduate students this could be an issue

Sen- Faculty may not be sure about policy, there could be uncertainty

Miller- I could see changing my final exams around to accommodate for this

Sen- Sometimes you don't have a choice. In my class we assess for graduate (rating)

Shannon- how long is exam period?

Peck- 5 days, and there's a weekend

Shannon-Could we make it the 3<sup>rd</sup> final day?

Sen- It could be hard to resolve something like this, so what do we want to make sure happens.

Wilson- Somebody should pull up Academic Calendar

Kaufman- \*goes over final exam days, grades due day is just one of the couple days' grades are due

Campsey- In the spring there's one day, Deans sends of a memo about how culminating experiences must be due. Very few people show up. We already make rules and we should/. There's a "catch me if you can attitude" with professors. Is this such a big deal

Sullivan- I agree

Shannon- That is not a good way to run a university. You have to do this for pedagogical reasons. We have to have standards. We could make the policy more flexible.

Sen- I've been teaching for 10 years and I've never come across this problem. There's always papers and we've never had a problem. Culminating experiences were due after dead da , but I've never heard of this coming up. We know when other people(faculty) are giving exams.

Peck- So the original purpose of this is so we don't give exams on dead ddays?

Kaufman- Yes

Peck-we should reaffirm that

Campsey-we should include exams or C.E.s cannot be given on dead days

Kaufman- Policy changes were approved by ISA but not read in academic senate. Senate rules say the policy is the responsibility of the next ISA committee

\*the bold lettering in the policy under 'Oversight for Culminating Activites' was looked at and changed to emphasize no classes or exams given on dead days :

**No classes or exams can be required, nor culminating experience due dates fall on, any day prior to the first day of final exams. This exclusion includes the date each semester listed on the official SJSU calendar as a "Study Day."**

Sen- could we leave the clear writing

Kaufman- (addition to the text in pink, written in bold) - Final examinations must occur during the scheduled final examination time in each course. **The required submission date and time for take-home examinations, final papers or other out-of-class activities must fall no earlier**

**than the first day of the final examination period. Final exams shall not be given, nor culminating activities due, during regularly scheduled class periods or on**

**"Study/Conference Day."** Supervision and individual study courses (180, 184, 297, 298, 299) are not required to have a culminating activity.

Kaufman-\*goes over rest of policies.

Do we want to specify when they are allowed? In the case of dancers who may take longer to evaluate.

Walters- Study day is spent performing. It can't be another times

Kaufman- \*editing policy under "Circumstances in which students may request the rescheduling of a culminating activity" Section b. to clear up how many

Khan- I have a problem with I. what if my due date is the last day of finals. Why should we specify that a paper or project has to be moved rather than final exam? Could we just leave it and have the student and instructors work it out instead of codifying it

Sen-W/o codifying it, doesn't leave much options

Khan- Would amount of papers given between two classes make a difference?

Sullivan- This policy says it has to be afterwards. Its more restrictive than pushing the paper around. Papers are individual

Hector- What if we ask that students can request an alternative exam day if there are 3 or more scheduled due dates. Instead of having a category only for papers, just include it w/ rest of finals

Sen- Is there an issue with where finals will be held if its changed

Kaufman- It wouldn't be for the whole class.

Hector- Because papers are already scheduled to be due at the end, it doesn't matter if it's a final, culminating experience, or exam. It would be more flexible if it needs to be rescheduled. If its three weeks prior, it would give students and their professors more time to work it out. Instead of three, maybe it could be at the beginning or 4 weeks prior.

Sullivan- I like the idea of putting the 3-week deadline in letter "b." to make it clear that you can't so this the week before its due.

\*Kaufman wrote the 3 week dead line in letter "b." under "Circumstances in which students may request the rescheduling of a culminating activity:"

Miller- If a student has a paper and 2 exams on the same day, what would the student do?

Processor would say, I'll give you a different exam at a later day. Student would probably go with the paper

Sullivan- paper is an individual effort. The exam being a different time causes the professor to change the exam and it might not be fair and equal.

Sen- It might be an entire class asking to move a paper.

How might that happen?

Sen- If all the papers are due at the end, two or more could fall on the same due date. And they're 12 page papers. Students would ask to change it, and since their cohorts they would probably do it as a group.

Sullivan- This sounds program-specific. That might not be applicable to other students.

Ng- If one student has a paper due, gets an extension, or changes date. Does this disadvantage students?

Sen- Causes difficulty for faculty

Hector- I would be able to identify with a student who has 3 papers due on the same day.

Ng- Does anyone have an issue with giving exams during the last week of classes. I heard you cannot give anything worth 30% or more before finals.

Simpson- I think it does happen, but we're not really giving final exams. But we'd give a "final assignment"

Spica- This should specify that papers cannot be turned in earlier that the first day of finals. Can final papers be turned in early?

Sen- Who verifies an emergency

Sullivan- There should be more specific language about what a verifiable emergency is.

Sen-This is going to the floor? There would probably be questions and suggestions, so shouldn't we spend more time now?

Kaufman-likely suggestions should be small. We can't be crafting policy on the senate floor, it'll take too long and probably be sent back.

Shannon- I propose we make it clear that changing paper days should be different from changing exams. We should leave the two separate finals

\*Kaufman changed "letter b., number i." to read: If one of the three or more culminating activities scheduled for the same day is a paper or project, the deadline for the paper/project will be moved to a mutually agreeable time within the final examination period. Also changed letter b., numeral ii. to read "If three or more finals are scheduled on the same day, the student may request an alternative exam date and/or time from any one of the instructors."

Kaufman- I think "oversight for Culminating Activities" section is fair. Should we leave the boldface?

We should take it out

\*Kaufman removed the bold lettering, other notes from different CSU policy, and citations

Sullivan- Can we add language to the "Oversight" section so deans can make a final determination. Just to cover bases and have the dean be a mediator.

\*Kaufman adds(additions in bold), primarily dictated by Shannon, The department chairperson will oversee culminating activities (examinations; portfolios; research or creative projects) in a manner that assures that the rules for culminating activities are followed. **If a dispute arises, the dean (or designee) will mediate the dispute.**

\*changed letter c. to remove language about consulting the Provost and to be consistent with the Oversight section

Khan- Under "exceptions to time frame" why do we need a letter "a." w/ no b

Kaufman- it can still be there, but I'll consult previous policies.

\*Kaufman capitalized "Time Frame"

Kaufman- are folks comfortable with me writing some information at the front to provide context. Like "whereas" statements. This has to go to the senate tomorrow night to be on the agenda.

Kaufman- Can we vote on it now?

Shannon- Motions to give Michael confidence in putting information at the front

Seconded by Sen

Committee votes to approve culminating activity policy

Vote carries unanimously with one abstention

Meeting adjourned at 3:45

December 5, 2016

PRESENT: Sharmin Khan, Alaric Trousdale, Mary Lynn Wilson, Laura Sullivan-Green, Michael Kaufman, Bill Campsey, Soma Sen, David Bruck, Eric Medrano, Jack Spica, Jenny Whyte, Lisa Simpson, Shannon Miller, Wendy Ng, Julia Curry (guest)

Meeting called to order at 3:00 pm.

Julia Curry came to speak about working with undocumented students at SJSU. She has been working with them for a number of years (since 2000). She discussed the significant legislation during the past 15 years that's affected those students.

State Policy AB 540: Dealt with immigrant children. Students who had attended 3 years of HS in the U.S., they were entitled for in-state tuition. While AB 540 undocumented students, those students weren't eligible for any California financial aid.

Passed in 2011: AB 130/131 California Dream Act enacted in 2012 and 2013. Allows for AB 540 students in-state tuition and apply for CA financial aid.

There are often many questions and issues for undocumented students and it's unclear about where they can go for assistance at SJSU. On campus, there is no central area where students can call for information about AB 540 and AB 130/131 material.

AB 540 includes students who are not undocumented at all, but have benefited from the legislation. We don't know the exact numbers of total undocumented students.

There are other university campuses have "Dream Centers" for Dream Act students. Need training for all individuals (staff, faculty) on the questions and issues that arise for undocumented students. There is no training for individuals about undocumented students at a system-wide level. The training should include resources on campus as well as familiarity with the legislation/laws that deal with undocumented students.

End: 4:00 pm

## Instruction & Student Affairs Committee Minutes--January 30, 2017

- Attended: Michael Kaufman (Chair), Sharmin Khan, Soma Sen, Sheryl Walters, Marian Yao, Lisa Simpson, Wendy Ng, Alaric Trousdale, Sameer Saran, Jack Spica, Juritzi Torres, Bill Campsey, David Bruck, Mary Lynn Wilson (Minutes).

### Call to Order: 1405

- Meeting Room for the semester
- Kaufman Reported
  - New university policy -- no one can reserve a room for the year.
  - I&SA will not meet in the usual room 4 times this semester
  - All room changes are noted on the Agenda

### Executive Committee Report--Kaufman

- President and Policies
  - President takes policy very seriously
  - She is not in favor of the following
    - Band aid policies
    - Policies made in response to one bad actor
    - Any policy that takes authority away from the President when the President has responsibility
    - Sloppily written or contradictory policy
- Questions
  - Does the President have a policy template for consistency?
  - What is the definition of shared governance?
    - Kaufman answered--The Academic Senate does not exclude administration and students. It includes them. We work together to solve problems.

### Student Success Committee Report--Khan

- Happy to hear about Honors at Entrance being eliminated
- I&SA should revisit Priority Registration policy and not just Honors, EOP, and other sub groups
- Question from ISA Committee
  - Does the Student Success Committee know that I&SA is overwhelmingly opposed to the California Promise

- Kaufman Answered--Thalia is working on this. A "Mystery Committee" is also working on it. However, Kaufman has not heard anything lately.

#### New York Times Article on Students Moving up Economic Index

- Using financial aid applications and tax returns, researchers studied if colleges were effective in moving students up the economic index.
  - SJSU ranked 8th in the nation
  - 2 other CSU were also in the top ten
  - Worry is that if states continue to disinvest in higher education, these gains will disappear
  - Kaufman will email the report to the committee

#### Minutes of Dec. 5, 2016--Julia Curry's presentation on undocumented students

- All approved

#### Final Exam Policy

- Reaffirms no final exams should be given on dead day or during the regular semester
- Concerns from Senate Floor were reviewed--mostly informational
- Committee discussed flexible final project/paper dates vs. final sit-down exam
  - Suggestion to change the way the university schedules final exams to take into account the different types of finals
  - If the faculty does not call something a final, it can be given at a different time during the semester
  - Every faculty member can go to the Dean's office and ask for an exemption from the current policy
  - Discussion of on-line finals in synchronous and asynchronous classes
    - Language added to the policy
      - Line 41--timed, sit-down exam and online synchronous final--to make document clearer
      - Line 48--online asynchronous exams should be treated as take-home exams

#### Continuous Graduate Enrollment Provision

- 3 tiered cost system depending on faculty time and equipment use
- Concerns from Senate Floor were reviewed--mostly informational
  - President was concerned that this would only apply to labs
    - Decision to remove the word "lab" from the examples in the policy
- Concerns from Marian Yao

- Leave of Absence issues--GAPE polices this
- Discussion on Retroactive adding of courses student is gone--add in line 131--discontinued students need to reapply for admission to graduate
- Who will monitor multiple graduate programs with different tiers--on line 103-- suggestion that GAPE should enforce
- Decision to table discussion so Yao and Bruck can discuss these issues in a sub committee

Adjourn: 15:55



Instruction & Student Affairs

Agenda

February 6, 2016

2:00 PM, CL412

Members Present: Mary Lynn Wilson, Sharmin Khan, Romando Nash, Sameer Saran, Marian Sofish, Shannon Miller, Juritzi Torres Mendoza, Sheryl Walters, Jack Spica, Wendy Ng, Hector Perea Jr., Soma Sen, David Bruck

Wendy Ng ran the meeting

Scribe: Soma Sen

1. Approval of minutes from 1-30

1-30 Minutes were approved. All in favor. Two abstentions.

2. Final clearance of [culminating experience](#) and [continuous enrollment](#) policies

***Culminating Experience***: Sharmin Khan asked for a review of the discussion on the policy and what changes were made last week. We reviewed the meeting minutes from last week for a recap. Further discussion ensued. Marian Sofish suggested that we should look at this issue more holistically (from faculty and admin side also) and to that end we could look at the late date submission of the grades. This could possibly relieve some of the turn-around pressure on faculty.

Motion to move the culminating experience to the senate for a second read was approved unanimously.

***Continuous Enrollment*** – Marian Sofish made the motion to table this discussion until the next committee meeting. Mary Lynn Wilson Seconded. Motion to table passed unanimously.

3. Discussion: when can repeaters register? [Referral](#)

There was some discussion. Shannon Miller expressed her view that any movement away from the current policy is better and that this issue needs a viable solution. Some of the questions raised in the discussion were: How about multiple repeats? Is this relevant only for the first repeat?

Marian Sofish - In order to simplify this policy we might have to define the target population. There might be a more optimal registration time for this sub-group of students. Maybe they can be waitlisted.

Jack Spica – how does this help students?

David Bruck's suggestion – wait until Smart Planner is in effect.

The committee moved to table this discussion until the next committee meeting.

4. [California promise referral](#) and [priority registration](#) discussion

Wendy Ng updated the committee on California promise. She clarified that the charge of this committee is only to work on the priority registration piece of this referral. The question is - where to put these students in priority registration?

More discussion ensued.

Romando Nash – the national data indicate that students who are taking 15 units do well. Getting students out in 4 years – larger discussion is needed. We should be implementing pieces of this bill any way.

Juritz Mendosa – Hardship on students that have to work and go to school.

Wendy Ng – given that our President had expressed her view that she would not pass policies that are just band aid measures, we need to think this through more carefully and just adding this group to the priority registration could be seen as a temporary solution.

We will continue this discussion.

5. Meeting Adjourned at 3:15 pm

## **IS&A Minutes 2.20.17**

### **Attendance:**

Sharmin Khan  
Sheryl Walters  
Bill Campsey  
Soma Sen  
Wendy Ng  
Romando Nash  
Mary Lynn Wilson  
David Bruck  
Alaric Trousdale  
Jack Spica  
Shannon Miller  
Michael Kaufman  
Marian Yao (Sofish)  
Juritzi Torres-Mendoza  
Lisa Simpson

### **1. Approval of Minutes from previous meeting:**

Motion to approve: David Bruck

Second: Juritzi Torres-Mendoza

Motion passed – unanimous with one abstention (Michael Kaufman)

### **2. Discussion on Policy on Continuous enrollment for graduate students.**

- David Bruck highlighted the changes to the policy (yellow highlights on document)
- Difference between 298 and 299 (299 can only be used for Thesis)
- Report in progress requirements
- Continuous enrollment and payment of fees
- Inclusion of policy number addressing the issue of seven year limit and need to reapply for admission

### **3. Vote on Continuous Enrollment Policy as amended**

Motion: Mary Lynn Wilson

Second: Shannon Miller

Vote: Unanimous (with two non-voting members)

### **4. Discussion on Priority Registration Policy**

- Reviewed Student Success committee policy revisions on priority registration
- Discussion on Guardian Scholars – included in priority group one
- Discussion on California Promise Students
- Discussion on list of priority group B from student success committee – how often is this

list reviewed – how is decision made

- FTES versus head count for the 10% available for priority registration
- Invite someone from SSC come to our meeting to discuss priority registration changes
- Marian will get more information on the actual number of students in each priority registration group

## **5. Honors Policy**

- Discussed revisions from the Honors Task Force – particularly Honors at Entrance and semester honors
- Discussion on Humanities Honors – how do they recruit and what are the requirements for gaining entrance to Humanities Honors program
- Discussion on Semester honors based on 12 units of work without summer and winter
- Changes would allow Freshman to get Honors their first semester
- Changes to Latin Honors threshold
- Still need to include information about the honors on the transcript
- Discussion about Incomplete and Report Delayed and Honors
- Discussion about CR/NC counted in the 12 units
- Discussion about part-time students not able to get semester honors if looking at a 12 unit per semester requirement
- Discussion on Humanities Honors designation on transcript – there is a GPA requirement and entrance but not on remaining in the program – should the Humanities Honors program be elevated to larger honors program consistent with other CSU honors programs - does not currently align with honors policy – possible certificate program

### **IS&A Minutes 3.06.17**

- Attendance:
  - Juritzi
  - Sameer Saran
  - Soma Sen
  - Sheryl Walter
  - Bill Campsey
  - Michael Kaufman
  - Marian Sofish
  - Sharmin Khan
  - Recognized Jack at 2.07
  - Lisa Simpson
  - Romando Nash
  - Wendy Ng
  - Alaric Trousdale
  - Mary Wilson
- Minutes
  - First, Campsey
  - Second Khan
  - Unanimous
- Priority registration in relation to California Promise
  - Stacey is here from Student Success Committee to give us insight on priority registration in relation to the California Promise. There are certain priority registration groups, such as veterans, that are mandatory through policy. However, the bill does give each campus the power to decide who is on priority. We know that for freshman and transfers priority registration until spring semester. This bill and priority registration was looked by Student Success Committee and was basically approved unanimously. Our campus decided that they will be on board for the California Promise. This means that starting this semester, they can apply to be a California Promise student, and be part of the program for next semester. We don't know how to fulfill the bill's "incentive" section. The deliverable goal as of now is estimated to be 50% of freshman to start off with 15 units. Honors at entrance has been struck for the eligibility list.
- Continuous Enrollment
  - Main Speaker: David Bruck on presenting the CIES edits and input.
  - CIES felt like it was too complicated that would require too much training. They did not like the three tiers because their concern was how do we push

people through faster. David buck wrote to CIES. They made some edits like took out the three tiered system, but approved. ISA reaction to the edits include that we like the added simplicity and the university president will also probably like it.

- Decision: unanimously passed into the Academic Senate
- Revalidation of expired courses
  - Strike the word "fairly" from phrase "fairly rigorous" in reference to the exam.
  - Add: ", in compliance with California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Article 7, Section 40510"
  - Add
  - whereas: SJSU does not have policy on expiration or revalidation of graduate coursework's; and
  - Vote: unanimous, David abstains because it is his policy)
- Honors Policy draft and data from our current students
  - tabled because time ran out
- Meeting ended at 3:53.

## **I SA Minutes 3.20.17**

### **Attendance: 13 in attendance including me**

Marian Yao; Sharmin Khan; Hector Perea; Wendy Ng; Shannon Miller; Soma Sen; Michael Kaufman; Sheryl Waters; Kevin Kinney; Lisa Simpson; Mary Lyn Wilson; Romando Nash; Alaric Trousdale; David Bruck; Juritzi Torres-Mendoza

#### **1. Approval of Minutes from Previous Meeting**

- Motion to approve: Mary Lynn Wilson
- Second: Lisa Simpson
- Motion passed with two abstentions

#### **2. Discussion on Honors Policy**

- Existing policy covers Honors at Entrance, Honor Roll, Latin Honors and Department Major. Removed is Honors at Entrance. The population of students starting with honors has grown significantly
- In new policy Honors at Entrance has been struck from the policy due to:
  - i. PeopleSoft has never placed a notation on a transcript
  - ii. Students who receive Honors at Entrance are supposed to get a letter from president, but that is not happening right now.
- Honors at Entrance is a completely separate issue than students being admitted to the Humanities Honors program (only has 130 students/year)
- Only about 1% of individuals eligible actually end up in the Humanities Honors program.
- Idea is to create something in the Honors policy whereas a block of courses could apply similarly across the board. So would be a parallel track for groups of courses that meet a specific criteria that contains something that distinguishes it (i.e. interdisciplinary, core group of classes, units. GPA, etc.).
- Michael will draft some language to this extent and will share it at the next ISA meeting.
- Highlighted the changes to the policy (yellow highlights on document)
- Discussed language around “Incomplete” notion and determining a drop dead date for classes with Incomplete grades to be completed as it relates to the Honors Policy.
- Discussed S09-7 and if the language contained reconciles with what is located in PeopleSoft and on the forms.

#### **3. Revisions to the Revalidation of Graduate Courses**

- David Bruck highlighted the changes to the policy (yellow highlights on document)

- Policy thought to be too prescriptive and limiting of academic freedom by member of academic senate
- Now reads an “examination of the student knowledge must be administered by the department...could be oral exam, written exam, research paper, or any other kind of format approved by department...”
- Updated language concerning “Unless a department makes an exception, independent study, seminar, internship, project, thesis, or comprehensive exam courses...”
- Updated language concerning approval added in “...the examining professor and the program’s graduate advisor and affirmed by the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies.”

#### **4. Registration period for students repeating courses (Did not discuss)**

#### **5. Closing Minutes topic:**

- Question as to why students are required to do the process that they currently have to do to reenroll in classes they were dropped from. Particularly is the letter/personal statement really necessary.
- Question posed to students of committee: What seems a reasonable task for students to have to do?
- Marian stated that having this policy has decreased the number of students applying for this from 800 to 300. University wants to know the reason why students are dropping.
- The fee structure for this process has not changed since its inception. This process is tied into FTES, but in this time of increased emphasis on 4 and 6 year graduation rates is it still effective.
- Marian will provide more data on this topic.



**IS&A meeting 4.3.17**  
**Minutes**

**In attendance:**

Sheryl Walters

Marian Yao

Lisa Simpson

Shannon Miller

Mary Lynn Wilson

Romando Nash

Hector Perez

Juritz Torres Mendoza

Jack Spica

Soma Sen

David Bruck

### **Approval of minutes from 3.20.17**

- Vote: unanimous approval

### **Updates:**

- Shannon will speak at the next Senate meeting in Michael's absence (4/10)
- Soma will chair the next IS&A meeting in Michael's absence (4/17)

### **Priority Registration Policy Discussion**

- Revised Group 2a to read "graduating seniors" in lieu of "graduating students." Moved graduate students to Group 2b
- Other areas remain as listed under 1.0
- Review of the Priority Group Table with number of IDs in each category
- Revised title to read "Registration Priority"
- Motion to Approve: Shannon Miller
- Second: Mary Lynn Wilson
- Vote: Unanimous approval

### **Honors Policy Discussion**

- Reviewed new addition of Special Course Sequence to Honors Policy
- Removed 1.3 "Any ambiguities in this policy shall be resolved by the Office of Graduate and Undergraduate (GUP), which will issue written clarifications as necessary to become a permanent record of interpretation."
- Removed section 4.2.3 "There must be a component of academic work that is unique to the SCSs..."
- Removed section 4.2.5 "SCSs must be constructed so as to provide the opportunity for transfer to participate."
- Revised 3.2.2.1 to read "use of a minimum required GPA in the major"
- Revised 3.2.2.2 to read "use of a minimum GPA requirement in a specified group of departmental major courses"
- Revised 4.2.2.1 to read "use of a minimum GPA requirement in the SCS"
- Motion: Hector Perez
- Second: Shannon Miller
- Vote: unanimous approval

### **Discussion of Referral for Repeating Class Registration**

- Currently repeating students are not allowed to register until first day of class which impedes their ability to make progress in their program
- Is there a way to allow them on the waitlist so that departments will be able to identify a need for more sections in time to create a new section?
- Is it possible to create a separate waitlist of repeaters?
- Jack shared information about other CSU policies on repeating a course
- How do repeaters impact bottleneck courses?
- How many students are we talking about in a given semester? How do we know how

- many people want to repeat?
- What happened prior to current policy in 2008?

Meeting adjourned: 3:37

In Attendance: Trousdale, Miller, Kaufman, Simpson, Khan, Wilson, Ng, Bruck, Spica, Nash, Perez, Walters

Minutes from 4/3/17 meeting: approved.

Resounding praise of Shannon Miller's performance at the 4/17/17 senate meeting.

First item of business: Honors policy

- Discussion of numbers of honors students in regards to Honors Convocation clause (2.7.1), and how detailed the policy should be. Awaiting more information here.
- The deletion of 1.3 was revisited.
- Revised 2.4, line 72 to read "Semester honors *may* be awarded" and also 'and/or' added in line 73. Added: "Retroactive honors requests shall be submitted to the Office of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs."
- It was agreed that 12 units would continue to be the criteria for semester honors.
- 4.1.1 revised, line 163: "SCS's are subject to the same unit minima as minors." Added.
- Various typos corrected.

Second item of business: Priority Registration policy

- 3.5 revised to read: "This requirement cannot apply to students participating in the California Promise as this program is mandated by state law." added.
- Discussion of the difference between group A and group B students.

New business:

- Discussion of making an exception for Math & Physics departments to run a trial allowing students repeating certain classes to register before the first day of class, as per current policy. Heads nodded, general assent granted.

Adjourned at 15:35.

I&SA Committee  
May 8, 2017

Present: Michael Kaufman, Marian Yao, Sharmin Khan, Soma Sen, Lisa Simpson, Sheryl Walters, Shannon Miller, Jack Spica, Carmen Medina, Romando Nash, Alaric Trousdale  
Scribe: David Bruck

Minutes: approved without modification

Honors Policy: questions from Senate addressed previously by committee.

Semester honors that come in after the deadline can be approved by AD of UGS.

Include requirement that Provost Office will be one to contact students to invite them to Honors Convocation? Worry by Provost is about numbers to fit into Event Center. Provost wants way to limit numbers by cancelling event occasionally. Projection from Registrar about current numbers, given raise in qualifying GPA, is that awardees will be greatly reduced (perhaps by half) so not such a problem. Committee agrees to keep old wording that requires the event to occur and not give the Provost the leeway.

Special course sequences: require same number as in a minor (12 units). One person against whole idea, but committee likes it.

Goodbye and thanks for all the fish.