SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE
2018/2019
Agenda
April 22, 2019, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm
Engineering 285/287

I. Call to Order and Roll Call:

II. Approval of Minutes:
Senate Minutes of March 25, 2019

III. Communications and Questions:
A. From the Chair of the Senate
B. From the President of the University

IV. Executive Committee Report:
A. Minutes of the Executive Committee –
EC Minutes of March 18, 2019
EC Minutes of April 10, 2019

B. Consent Calendar –
Consent Calendar of April 22, 2019

C. Executive Committee Action Items –

V. Unfinished Business:
AS 1737, Policy Recommendation, Blended Bachelor's and Master's Program (First Reading)

VI. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation)
A. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
AS 1740, Amendment A to University Policy S17-4, Membership of the Student Success Committee (First Reading)

AS 1735, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy F15-13, Updating the Board of General Studies Membership, Charge, and Responsibilities (First Reading)

AS 1738, Senate Management Resolution, Amendment of Bylaw 5, Membership of the Committee on Committees (Final Reading)

B. University Library Board (ULB):

C. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
AS 1736, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to S14-9, Guidelines for Concentrations (Final Reading)

D. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
AS 1741, Policy Recommendation, Rescind F75-6, Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) Requirement for Resident Alien Students (First Reading)

E. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

VII. Special Committee Reports:

A. ***Exceptional Admissions Report*** by Sharon Willey, Senior AVP for Enrollment Management, ***Time Certain: 2:30 p.m.***

B. ***Athletics Reports*** by Annette Nellen, Chair of the Athletics Board, and Tamar Semerjian, Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR), Marie Tuite, Athletics Director, Eileen Daley, Sr. Associate Athletics Director, and David Rasmussen, Sr. Associate Athletics Director for Compliance, ***Time Certain: 3:00 p.m.***

VIII. New Business:

IX. State of the University Announcements:

A. CSU Faculty Trustee (by standing invitation)
B. Statewide Academic Senators
C. Provost
D. Associated Students President
E. Vice President for Administration and Finance
F. Vice President for Student Affairs
G. Chief Diversity Officer

X. Adjournment

2018/2019 Academic Senate

MINUTES
March 25, 2019

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Fifty-Two Senators were present.

Ex Officio:
Present: Frazier, Van Selst, Manzo, Lee, J., Rodan
Absent: None

Administrative Representatives:
Present: Ficke, Wong(Lau), Faas, Day
Absent: Papazian

Deans / AVPs:
Present: Olin, Ehrman, Elliott
Absent: Stacks

Students:
Present: Fernandez-Rios, Gallo, Gill Kethepalli, Pang, Rodriguez
Absent: None

Alumni Representative:
Present: Walters

Emeritus Representative:
Present: McClory

Honorary Representative:
Present: Lessow-Hurley

General Unit Representatives:
Present: Trousdale, Hurtado, Higgins, Monday, Emmert
Absent: None

CHHS Representatives:
Present: Schultz-Krohn, Shifflett, Grosvenor, Chin, Sen
Absent: None

COB Representatives:
Present: He, Bullen, Khavul
Absent: None

EDUC Representatives:
Present: Marachi, Mathur
Absent: None

ENGR Representatives:
Present: Sullivan-Green
Absent: Ramasubramanian, Kumar

H&A Representatives:
Present: Riley, Ormsbee, McKee
Absent: Mok, Khan

SCI Representatives:
Present: Cargill, French, Kim, White
Absent: None

SOS Representatives:
Present: Peter, Wilson, Curry, Trulio, Raman
Absent: None

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes– The Senate minutes of March 4, 2019 were approved as is.

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate –

Chair Frazier announced that the President is in Washington D.C. at CSU Hill Day along with the Chancellor.

Trustee Sabalius is one of two nominees for Faculty Trustee recommended by the ASCSU to the Governor.

B. From the President of the University – Not present

IV. State of the University Announcements:

A. Provost:

Provost Ficke announced that they have polled 679 tenure and tenure track faculty using the Coache Survey and that is a 47% response rate. The Provost would like to see that over 50%. Hopefully next year that can be extended to lecturers. The survey closes on April 4, 2019.

GUP (Graduate and Undergraduate Programs) has been unpacked this year, and we decided to remove certain functions from student and faculty success to the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. What remained was the student success functions. We then analyzed which of these functions should belong with the AVP of Undergraduate Studies, and which functions should belong with student affairs. Advising will always remain with the faculty. Enrollment functions will be more clearly lodged with student affairs and we will have someone overseeing enrollment, which is long overdue.

We did a very comprehensive survey of students as well as held focus groups to determine how students felt about advising at SJSU. What we are trying to do now is to get ahold of all the different pieces.

Questions:

Q: I have a question about the Student Success Collaborative.
A: What do you mean Student Success Collaborative?
Q: From what I understand it is where faculty are being encouraged to submit names of their students that are struggling. I just now clicked on the link and it took me to a page that has my name and five names of my students. I'm wondering if we can get a report on this project? What happens when a name is submitted?
A: I know less than you. Let me ask VP Day about it.
A: VP Day commented: "I do know a little about it. One of the questions I have is what information is coming in, where is it going, and who is stewarding that data. They are getting very good answers to those questions, but the fact that you don't know that is one of the reasons we need to start looking at some of these questions. There are a range of software conversations happening, but I'm not convinced we have done our due diligence to not only implement them, but to communicate what they are."

C: "I just conducted a survey myself on how students felt about advising and were they aware of the advising resources on campus. I received 114 responses. I'd be happy to share this with you if you email me." [**Fernandez-Rios, AS Director of University Advising Affairs]**

B. Associated Students President: Report to be distributed by email.

C. Vice President for Administration and Finance:

The Faculty and Staff Dining Room will open at the end of the month in IRC 302.

The grand opening for the Student Recreation and Aquatics Center (SRAC) is on April 18, 2019. VP Faas encouraged Senators to visit SRAC and noted that it was on time and on budget.

Groundbreaking for the new Science building is April 25, 2019. It has been in the works over 30 years.

Down on South campus, we are just finishing the Beach Volleyball Courts. It was mostly paid for by donations and the balance came from naming rights. The courts are open to students, faculty, and staff as well.

The VPAF is currently doing background checks on the prime candidate for the Chief of Police. He will share information on who that is as soon as those checks are completed.

We have an RFP out for pouring rights for beverages on campus. We had three groups reply to that. This would be for soda, water, and various beverages throughout the campus. We have a committee reviewing that.

VP Faas sits on a Revenue Opportunities Task Force out of the Chancellor's Office. We have met about three times and are looking at opportunities to bring revenue to the campus from alternative channels. What some of those opportunities might look like include having a system-wide naming opportunity for an airline such as "Southwest Airlines, the official airline of the CSU," as an example, or "Hilton Hotels, the official hotel of the CSU." What you need to know about that is that it doesn't mean we have to use them, it just means we could get rebates for usage. On May 6th and 7th some of the members of the task force will be on campus and a number of you will be invited to attend those meetings.

Questions:

Q: Could you explain in more detail the use of the foot print for the Science building longer term, one building going up, multiple buildings going up, and a timeline?
A: Sure, the Science building will go up next to the 4th street garage, Duncan Hall will be behind the Science building and San Carlos will be in front of it. It is a 170,000 square foot building with eight stories. It is a small foot print on the ground, but it is going up quite high. It should be done within 1 ½ to 2 years. The plot of land where the AS House used to be is tentatively planned to be the Innovation Center. This would all be donor funded. Right now that would be a three or four story building, but could go higher if fundraising is more successful. We will also

renovate one of the Duncan Towers, then we will flip it and renovate the other one. People will be moved around during the renovations. This should take 1 ½ to 2 years for each tower. After it is done, then we can get rid of the old Science building. Essentially, it should be about six or seven years.

Q: When you are negotiating with the companies over pouring rights, is there any way to get them to not use single use plastics?
A: Absolutely.

Q: I was really looking forward to being the first person in line for the Sports Center, and then I went online and was a little shocked at the price. It was $50 with early registration a month, otherwise it is $60 a month.
A: It is a lot cheaper than Club Sport or any of the other places around here.
Q: Actually not, there is a club around the corner from where I live that is the same price. I think it is really expensive. I was hoping for maybe $30 or something like that. Is there anything being considered to make it more affordable?
A: Those fees are determined by the Student Union Board. It was paid for with student fees so its primary use is for students. It is open to faculty and staff at various rates, and market demand will dictate what those rates are.
Q: Only students that are full time do not have to pay. Students that are part time have to pay $112.

Q: What does digital asset refer to with regard to the pouring rights?
A: I think the only digital asset we have right now is in front of the Event Center.
Q: This isn't like an app where they are going to connect the student's data to something?
A: There will be no student data coming out.

Q: As far as the new sports center is concerned, I heard through the grapevine that they will be checking people in with a hand scanning. Is there any way to opt out of that?
A: They are actually doing this right now in the Student Union, so maybe you could walk over and ask them. I don't know yet.

Q: I just wanted to ask about the measures being taken to keep the construction quiet during class time?
A: The actual first time anything is put in the ground will be late May, so classes will be out.
Q: Summer classes will be in session then.
A: There will always be some form of construction going on as long as VP Faas is here. We will minimize the interruptions as best as we can. We won't have construction during finals, etc.

D. Vice President for Student Affairs:

The VPSA has been going through the annual process of impaction planning. We are required to submit a plan about how we will negotiate our impaction status and what

kinds of things we will put in place in terms of additional academic requirements and also our admission area. We have added some coursework in Engineering areas. We also considered the expansion of our local admissions area. Students in our local admissions area get a .25 GPA bump when they apply to SJSU. In previous years, our local admissions area has been limited to Santa Clara County. Our colleagues at East Bay, which is also impacted, has a local admissions area that includes all the counties in the Bay and Santa Clara County. When SFSU was impacted, their local admissions area was all the counties in the Bay and Santa Clara County. At some point, we made a determination that we only needed to be in Santa Clara County. We made a recommendation to the President this year that we extend the local admissions area to be consistent with the campuses in the local area. We went through a hearing process and got some really good feedback from folks, particularly in Monterey and San Benito counties. In San Benito and Monterey counties there are very few community colleges. We ended up making a recommendation to the President to extend the local admissions area to include Santa Clara County as well as the counties to the South of us. The President approved that recommendation and we have moved forward with this request to the Chancellor with the exception of the business programs at CSU Monterey. CSU Monterey notified us they are trying to grow their business programs so we did not include them in our area to be respectful to them.

Questions:
Q: We have a few very small programs like Meteorology, do those have the same impaction areas as the rest or is it statewide for these programs?
A: Off the top of my head I can't give you an answer to that, but they would be covered by this impaction plan. Keep in mind that 60% of the students that apply to SJSU gain admission. We have already had programs that are hard to gain access to because there is extraordinary demand. As you might imagine, those are in Engineering areas.

Q: My question has to do with the admission standards for transfer students. I'm worried if making the admissions standards more stringent isn't an inadvertent way to try and push all programs into ADT. I'm very concerned about that. There are a number of programs in Engineering that have lower division courses that schools don't offer because they are expensive to offer, or don't have a large draw for students. We run into issues with this. Is there any push towards that with the supplemental criteria?
A: Good question. The majority of that is a conversation that faculty need to have informed by the enrollment data that my team can provide. One of the complaints we heard from San Benito is exactly that, that students can't even get those classes that would give them an advantage. We need a different kind of enrollment process. We need to build on what we have so far so that faculty can make those kinds of decisions about those classes.

There are several reviews going on right now including Counseling, and Greek Life. We are also reviewing the enrollment planning process, and we just got the final safety report on the residence halls.

The food pantry has a soft opening today and will have a more formal opening later.

There is lots of noise right now about housing security, but this is being taken very seriously. We are deeply committed to this, but there are no simple answers. If you have any suggestions, please feel free to contact VP Day.

E. Chief Diversity Officer:

The first thing I would like to talk about is Title IX. We will have some interim Title IX procedures that will be in effect until Executive Orders 1096 and 1097 come out in the fall. These changes are based on a USC case; *Doe v. Allee* (2018). The case basically says that after January 4, 2019, we need to provide some sort of hearing procedure for complainants or respondents in particular. The Chancellor's Office and General Counsel have worked out procedures that comply with the court of appeals ruling that provide some kind of buffer for our students in terms of the process of the hearing. As soon as we received this on January 4, 2019, we had to put a stop to all our cases in terms of moving forward. The court cases and the interim procedures cover only those cases that meet these three criteria; one is that it must be a student-on-student sexual misconduct case, two is that they result in serious discipline for the respondent, and three is that the main crux of the case is based on credibility analysis of witnesses and complainants/respondents. For cases that meet the three criteria, we will now have a hearing officer from the CSU system that has been vetted by the CSU that all the CSU campuses will access. We have between four to possibly seven of those cases. What the CSU has told us is that it will not be a direct cross examination, but people can skype in or zoom in. The respondent and witnesses will be in different rooms so that they cannot directly question each other. Also, questions will have to be submitted at least 10 days in advance. We have a long proposed draft of a procedure. I can assure you that between Stanford University personnel, staff from the CDO's office, and staff from the Student Conduct Office, we are going to try very hard to coordinate the hearings so that they occur during normal Human Resources hours. This is where we are at right now. All of the normal functions we provide for students such as accommodations, support, etc. are still going on. There are a group of us, including VP Day, that are heading up to Sacramento State tomorrow for a question and answer session with the Title IX folks and the General Counsel to work out all the nuts and bolts and details.

The Muslim-American community on campus worked with the MOSAIC Center as well as with San Jose Police to organize a vigil on the Saturday following the massacre. It was very well received. About 40 people attended. The speaker gave a multi-religions speech on the steps of MLK. The Diversity Office as well as Student Affairs is keeping in contact with these students in case they need accommodations, et.

On April 25, 2019, the Faculty Diversity Committee and the CDO's Office are putting on a best practices showcase to celebrate diversity, equity and inclusion. We received 51 nominations. The event is from 2:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. in Engineering 285/287. The CDO encouraged Senators to attend.

On May 6th and May 7th, SJSU will be hosting all the CDO's from the CSU campuses for a two-day meeting with overnight accommodations in the residence halls.

The new diversity trainer, Craig Alamo, has been working on some pretty comprehensive professional development opportunities for students, faculty, and staff in Social Work and the College of Engineering that will run over the summer and into the fall.

We have enlisted 22 doctorate and post doctorate students from URM group. The CDO thanked the departments that hosted them as well as the speakers that talked to them about working at San José State.

F. CSU Faculty Trustee (by standing invitation): The CSU Faculty Trustee submitted his report electronically to the Academic Senate.

G. Statewide Academic Senators:

At the last plenary on March 14-15, 2019, the ASCSU passed are resolutions in support of some legislative bills. Chair Frazier sent this out to the Senate earlier this month for review. The ASCSU also passed a resolution in support of those being separated by border issues and a resolution on infringement of faculty intellectual property. The ASCSU also asked for flexibility in implementation of early start programs on some of the campuses. As you know, that is contentious since the Chancellor is steadfast in implementing EO 1100 and EO 1110. Finally, the ASCSU talked about the GE Task Force report. That report came from a body constituted by the ASCSU. It had members on it that were part of the system including trustees and faculty. It is merely a statement of that committees' views on general education. It is not the official position of the ASCSU or the CSU system. The Chancellor's Office did not issue that report, so all of the reactions to that GE report should be framed as a reaction to the fact that there are several folks out there that think we should be revising our GE. I happen to be one of those folks that think we should always be revising our GE to make sure we are educating our students to the standards that make them most effective at what they want to do with their life. A lot of the campus Senates are rejecting the report. That seems to be the majority opinion. However, the ASCSU has not yet taken an official stance on the GE report. This body's reaction to the report is the most responsible reaction I've seen in the CSU so far. We have decided to constitute our own little committee to review the report and decide what we think GE should be, then we will help the ASCSU craft an opinion.

Questions:

Q: My concern with the GE Task Force document is that it somehow became something that we react to and in some ways gets to set the terms. This is why I have reservations about the process.

A: I agree it set the tone. However, I think the very strong reaction across the CSU set another tone. I'm not sure which direction this will go.

Q: Can you identify for us on that list of legislative bills, what the ASCSU sees as high priority?
A: The highest priorities are in green and go down from highest to lowest. I don't necessarily agree with all the priority.

V. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:
Executive Committee Minutes of February 25, 2019- No questions
Executive Committee Minutes of March 18, 2019- No questions

B. Consent Calendar:
Consent Calendar of March 25, 2019
The AVC announced the Senate General Election Results for Spring 2019

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

VI. Unfinished Business:

VII. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation)

A. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
Senator Shifflett presented ***AS 1738, Senate Management Resolution, Amendment of Bylaw 5, Membership of the Committee on Committees (First Reading).***
Questions:
Q: This states that the members will not be members of the Senate, but the AVC sits on the Senate?
A: We discussed that offline, and the AVC is an elected position to Chair the Committee on Committee. That seat is not an appointed college seat.
Q: The AVC sits in her college seat. There is no extra seat for the AVC?
A: O&G will talk about that.

Senator Shifflett presented ***AS 1735, Amendment A to University Policy F15-13, Updating the Board of General Studies (BOGS) Membership, Charge, and Responsibilities (First Reading).*** The O&G Committee reviewed the membership and charge of BOGS and decided that BOGS did not need to exist outside the committee infrastructure as an "Other" committee. Next, careful attention to the review of new proposed GE courses at the front end as we do with courses in the major is really what is needed rather than recertification. Periodic review would be folded into the program planning process. Periodic review does include review of all courses inclusive of GE and is already the case. The diversion of all GE courses to BOGS is really not necessary. If the Program Planning Committee has a question or concern about a GE course it can't resolve itself, it could ask BOGS or the GE Advisory Committee for assistance. Next, assessment of the GE program needs to happen at the program level. Discussions in O&G were wide ranging. O&G is recommending that a GE Advisory Committee be constituted as an Operating Committee reporting to the Curriculum and Research Policy Committee. College

representatives would be recruited and appointed the same as other operating committee members. The chair would be appointed by the Provost in consultation with the Executive Committee. O&G felt it was really important to have an Operating Committee that focused solely on GE with their role being one of support and review of new course proposals.

Questions:

Q: Has the committee considered the workload that the Curriculum and Research Committee will end up having?

A: Outreach will be done to C&R and other committees after this meeting. Secondly, as for the review of new courses, we are only talking about one per month. Prior to this review, the GE Advisory Committee will make a recommendation to C&R.

Q: Why can't this Operating Committee elect its own chair like every other operating committee?

A: In the old policy BOGS reported to the Provost, so it didn't seem appropriate to remove the Provost's involvement completely. This was a compromise. O&G will consider it.

Q: The code requirement is not inherent in the name GEAC, I suggest that we explicitly include that in the name. Will the committee consider this? I also think it is paramount that the committee elect its own chair otherwise it removes power from the committee. There could always be consultation with the Provost. Will the committee consider this?

A: Yes, thank you.

Q: Did the committee consider including the evaluation of GE Assessments during the Program Planning phase in the charge?

A: What would happen if the President approved this is that the department files all its information which includes the five data elements. The call to the departments would still include submitting summary reports of GE and individual assessment materials to the Program Planning Committee. If the Program Planning Committee had questions it could not answer, then it could refer that course to the GE Advisory Committee for advice. The GE Advisory Committee would send that advice back to the GE Advisory Committee.

Q: If the GEAC charge says GEAC receives and solicits course information, what do they do with it? This isn't really clear. Also, under the last resolved can we remove the reference to the year of the guidelines that way we don't have to modify the policy every time the guidelines are changed.

A: O&G will clarify this.

Q: I don't recall if Associate Dean Wendy Ng is included by title in the membership, but if she is not then why not? The other question is about membership in general. Advisory committees are usually advisory because they have expertise. Expertise isn't equally distributed on a college-by-college basis. For instance, there is no seat for an American Institutions representative on this committee, so if you pick the wrong COSS representative, there might be no one on the advisory committee that

can give advice.
A: Hence the O&G Committee left in the language that gives the GE Advisory Committee the ability to constitute what used to be called GEAP Review Panels to give them advice. Also, none of the positions currently in the membership have been deleted. AVP Ng has been the representative to BOGS.

Q: Can you help me understand in light of the external examiners report, what change will this address? Second, why was C&R consulted, but BOGs wasn't consulted until 2 days ago?
A: O&G will get all information before bringing this back as a "final reading." In regard to the external reviewer's notes, O&G was working on the note to clarify GE governance and leadership and that stakeholder's need to find ways think creatively about the program as a whole, and that we should make assessment meaningful. These were principles from the external report that were discussions in O&G.

Q: The examiner's report noted that there was a problem with too many agencies being involved. This doesn't change that at all. Would the committee consider addressing how this actually improves governance?
A: Certainly. However, I would say that consideration has already been part of the discussion. The GE Advisory Committee acting in giving feedback back to the Program Planning Committee really does clarify this process.

Q: There is no mention of faculty led development of GE, and quality of proposal or quality of content? Would the committee consider adding language?
A: What is in here calls on the GE Advisory Committee to work within the content of the GE Guidelines. I don't think we will need to bring in much of that.
Q: I'm concerned about moving away from college elections of faculty representatives to the Committee on Committees appointment process. Will the committee consider this?
A: It would follow the normal Committee on Committees process for all committees.

Q: I'm concerned about bias in the selection of committee members and so I would also like to see more language about the criteria for membership. Would the committee consider this?
A: The information we are taking in is coming from two streams. One stream really applies to the GE Guidelines. This will result in O&G compiling reports that will then be given to the group that will be updating the GE Guidelines. We will make sure all the information gets to the people updating the guidelines.

Q: Do you know who is updating the guidelines?
A: GE Advisory Committee.

B. University Library Board (ULB): No report.

C. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
Senator White presented ***AS 1713, Policy Recommendation, University Writing:***

Requirements/Guidelines and Support by the University Writing Committee (Final Reading).

Senator Peter presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change line 162 to read, "Graduate Studies of at least three units in which a major written report is required." Senator Mathur presented an amendment to line 154 to strike "elective." The Mathur motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the Mathur amendment was approved unanimously. Senator White presented an amendment to line 151, section a. where it reads, "Every department (or equivalent unit) responsible for a graduate degree program shall…" to change it to read, "Every department (or equivalent Unit) responsible for a graduate degree program shall include a course that also includes GWAR in the program requirements and overall units." The White motion was seconded. Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to the White amendment that was friendly to the body to change it to read, "…shall include a course that satisfies GWAR in the program." Senator White noted that the title was not what he had submitted and lines 8 and 83 needed to be changed to read, "University Writing: Requirements/Guidelines and University Writing Committee (UWC)." [Note: The original document had two different titles on the first and second page. The Senate Administrator believed that "Support by" was accidentally dropped from page 2 and added it in.] Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change line 138, section d.ii, to read, "… approved by the Curriculum and Research Committee." Senator White presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change "recommend" in line 177 to "recommended." Senator Sullivan-Green presented an amendment to add "written in English" after "publication" in line 166. The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Sullivan-Green Amendment passed with 2 Nays. Senator Ehrman presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to 2.b.iii. on line 167 to add, "with a substantive writing requirement" after, "Completion of a master's or doctoral program." Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to strike, "every three years" on line 177 and replace it with, "at the time of the course home department program planning process." The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Shifflett Amendment passed with 7 Nays. Senator Van Selst presented an amendment to add "normally" before "at the time of the course home departments program planning process." The amendment was not seconded**.** **The Senate voted and AS 1713 passed as amended unanimously**.

Senator White presented ***AS 1736, Amendment A to University Policy S14-9, Guidelines for Concentrations (First Reading).***

Questions:

Q: In section IV, where it states that, "the Office of Undergraduate Studies and College of Graduate Studies will evaluate existing concentrations," that is referencing curriculum which should be in the purview of faculty but there are no faculty in the College of Graduate Studies to evaluate existing concentrations."

A: The committee will consider it.

D. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):

Senator Sullivan-Green presented ***AS 1730, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy S15-3, Leaves of Absences for Students (Final Reading).***

Senator Peter presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to add to line 25, "Resolved that S15-3 be amended as shown below." Senator Rodan presented an amendment to Senator Peter's Amendment to add "in its entirety" before "as shown below." The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the amendment failed. Senator Rodan presented a motion to refer back to the committee. The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Rodan motion failed**. The Senate voted and AS 1730 was approved as amended with 1 Nay**.

Senator Sullivan-Green presented ***AS 1731, Policy Recommendation, Rescind and Replace S05-4, Qualifications for Student Office Holders (Final Reading).***
Questions:
Q: In section 1.1, line 31, it says, "The CSU memo delegates to campus presidents the authority to define specific terms of the policy to establish additional requirements for student office holders." With that language in place, in section 2.1.6, can't we adjust the semester unit to a maximum of 150 and 50 units for graduates. Does the language in 1.1 give us the authority to change the information in 2.1.6?
A: I believe that language is about education requirements, but does not give the President the authority to make the information in the memo less stringent.
Q: The language "additional" does in general terms mean you can make it stronger.
A: What is your proposition?
Q: Bring it down.
A: The committee will consider it.

Senator Shifflett made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the motion passed and the meeting adjourned.

E. Professional Standards Committee (PS): Senator Peter presented ***AS 1728, Policy Recommendation, Amendment H to University Policy S15-7, RTP Procedures; Criteria for "Late Add" Materials (Final Reading).*** The Senate voted and AS 1728 was approved unanimously as written.

VIII. Special Committee Reports:

IX. New Business:

X. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

AGENDA

Academic Senate – Executive Committee
March 18, 2019, noon-1:30, ADM 167

1. Approval of meeting minutes of March 11
2. Consent calendar
3. President's update
4. Senate agenda for March 25
5. Editorial change to Policy S14-6 (see below)
6. University updates
    a. Chief Diversity Officer
    b. Provost
    c. VP Administration and Finance
    d. VP Student Affairs
    e. Associated Students
    f. Statewide Senate
7. Policy committee updates
    a. Curriculum & Research
    b. Organization & Government
    c. Instruction & Student Affairs
    d. Professional Standards

Editorial change to policy:

Policy S14-6, Sec. 4.3:

> The University President designates the Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research as the Institutional Official with the responsibility to oversee and administer the institution's program of animal care and use.

Title to change to "Associate Vice President for Research."

Executive Committee Minutes
March 18, 2019
ADM 167, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Present: Frazier, Peter, Ficke, Shifflett, Sullivan-Green, White, Marachi, Faas, Wong(Lau), Day, Mathur, Lee, Manzo, Papazian
Absent: Riley

1. The Executive Committee approved the minutes of March 11, 2019 as amended.

2. The agenda for the March 25, 2019 Senate meeting was amended to place State of the University Announcements as item IV right after the Chair's and President's Communications and Questions. President Papazian will not be able to attend the March 25, 2019 Senate meeting.

3. The Executive Committee discussed a requested editorial change to University Policy S14-6 by the AVP of Research's Office. The requested change would change the reference to the AVP of Graduate Studies and Research to the AVP of Research throughout the policy. A member suggested that the title be changed to the VP of Research & Innovation or designee given that we are in the process of hiring a new VP. A member noted that the AVP of Research had participated in writing this policy and that they thought it might be a requirement that a specific person had to be identified in the policy as the person directly responsible for Human Subjects. The committee decided a referral to the Curriculum and Research Committee would be best to determine exactly what is required by law and policy with regard to S14-6.

4. Updates from the President:
   President Papazian has had offsite interviews with the Vice President for Research & Innovation (VPRI) candidates. Finalists will be coming to the campus and meetings will be set up with the Executive Committee, AS, the Deans, etc.

   The Strategic Plan will be launched on April 8, 2019. A save the date message will go out soon.

   The President and Chief of Staff Millora have discussed the Senate's request to setup a bullying taskforce. The President and Chief of Staff believe that this is best handled by increasing awareness and educating faculty and students, and should be housed in the Office of Diversity. The Chief of Staff will be working with Student Affairs and Academic Affairs on this matter.

   Questions:
   Q: Looks like this would set up a permanent group. Why not constitute the taskforce to study what all the issues pertaining to bullying are on campus?

A: The President will take this back to the Chief of Staff.

Q: We don't know what all the issues are and this is why we asked for a taskforce to study it.
A: We are talking about a working group falling under the Office of Diversity. President Papazian suggested anyone concerned should reach out to the Chief of Staff.

Q: Can you comment on the letter [submitted by members of the University Library Board raising concerns about funding for new library books]?
A: We are trying to accommodate the needs of the library.

A member stated that he/she was not sure where this information that they can't buy books is coming from and that conversations with the Dean of the Library hadn't touched on this. Our library is complicated for various reasons, one of which is that it is a joint public/academic library.

Q: This is an immediate problem. The library feels they can't buy monographs this year and if they can't buy them until next year there will be a hole in the collection. In the past, $1.9 million in lottery funds was given to the library. Are they still getting this allocated to their budget?
A: Salary savings were being used in the library to buy books. This is a structural problem. The President is working to create a process that allows us to respond before these types of things become problems. Right now we are addressing these problems as they come up. The Provost wants to have a conversation with the Dean of the Library about this. The Senate Chair asked how to respond to the ULB letter, and the answer was that, that the Provost will have the conversation with the Dean.

5. Updates from the Administrators:
    a. From the CDO:
    Title IX changes are coming. The changes affect the hearing process for some sexual assault and battery cases; we have about five to nine affected cases. The Title IX Coordinator and Student Conduct Officer will ensure there is no direct questioning of sexual assault victims.

    The CDO will be hosting all CSU CDOs for a meeting at SJSU on June 6-7, 2019.

    b. From the Provost:
    There has been a 47.6% response rate to the COACHE Survey. However, the Provost wants that over 50%.

    c. From the Vice President of Administration and Finance (VPAF):
    The VPAF will be hosting the campus safety walk for anyone that would like to attend, on April 15, 2019 at 7:30 pm.

d. From the Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA):
The University is requesting that its service area be expanded to include Monterey and San Benito counties. However, this expansion will not include the College of Business, as respondents in Monterey County raised objections to that.

6. Updates from the Associated Students President (AS):
AS is conducting elections right now. They had 37 students eligible for offices. Branden Parent is running unopposed for AS President.

The community garden got a grant of $3,000.

This is the 50th anniversary of the AS Print and Tech Shop and they will be offering discounts.

AS will be going through an external review process next week.

The Executive Director candidates will be on campus for interviews.

7. Updates from the CSU Statewide Senator:
The GE Taskforce Chair gave a report to the ASCSU.
There were two resolutions as a result of that. The first was to formally receive the taskforce report and to refer to committees. The second was to reject the report. Both resolutions are set to come for a final reading at the May meeting.

The ASCSU is looking into how to fit in other priorities. Campuses have been given an invitation to give their opinions.

Resolutions that passed included support for the Doctorate of Occupational Therapy, faculty intellectual property, and support for a bond measure on mental health.

Another resolution was to oppose a legislative proposal to mandate ethnic studies. The ASCSU did not want the legislature writing curriculum, but also didn't want to be seen as opposing ethnic studies.

8. Updates from the Policy Committees:
a. From the Chair of the Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
C&R will be bringing a resolution regarding the University Writing Committee for a final reading to the March 25, 2019 Senate meeting. C&R will also bring resolutions on the 4+1 blended bachelor's and master's degree program, and on concentrations for first readings.

b. From the Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
O&G will be bringing a Senate Management Resolution with a change to bylaw 5 to provide clarifying language before the membership section for the Committee on Committees.

c. From the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
I&SA will bring their three first readings from the last Senate meeting back for final readings at the March 25, 2019 Senate meeting.

d. From the Professional Standards Committee (PS):
The PS committee will bring an amendment to the RTP criteria policy regarding late adds. PS will be meeting with the Provost today to discuss.

9. The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

These minutes were taken and transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on March 22, 2019. The minutes were edited by Chair Frazier on March 22, 2019 and approved by the Executive Committee on April 10, 2019.

AGENDA

Academic Senate – Executive Committee

April 10, 2019, noon-1:30, ADM 167

1. Approval of meeting minutes of March 18
2. Consent calendar
3. Elections calendar
4. President's update
5. Policy committee updates
    a. Professional Standards
    b. Curriculum & Research
    c. Organization & Government
    d. Instruction & Student Affairs
6. University updates
    a. Statewide Senate
    b. Chief Diversity Officer
    c. Provost
    d. VP Administration and Finance
    e. VP Student Affairs
    f. Associated Students

Executive Committee Minutes
April 10, 2019
ADM 167, 12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Present: Frazier, Peter, Ficke, Shifflett, Sullivan-Green, White, Marachi, Faas, Day, Mathur, Lee, Riley
Absent: Papazian, Manzo, Sullivan-Green, Wong(Lau)

1. The Executive Committee approved the minutes of March 18, 2019 as amended.

2. The Executive Committee approved the consent calendar of April 10, 2019.

3. The Executive Committee approved the Elections Calendar for 2020.

4. Updates from the Policy Committee Chairs:

    a. From the Professional Standards Committee (PS):
    PS is working on range elevation for lecturers and the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility policies, but they may not come to the Senate until Fall 2019.

    b. From the Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
    C&R will be bringing a policy on Concentrations for a final reading, and the 4+1 blended degree policy for a first reading to the next Senate meeting.

    C&R also has two Organized Research Units (ORUs) to review.

    The Curriculum policy will be pushed into Fall 2019; however, all other referrals should be completed by then unless more arrive.

    c. From the Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
    O&G will be bringing an update to bylaw 5 regarding the Committee on Committees for a final reading, and a second-first reading of the Board of General Studies membership and charge policy.

    d. From the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
    I&SA will be bringing the TOEFL policy for a first reading, and is beginning to review the University Governance Award (UGA) policy.

    e. From the CSU Statewide Senator:
    The ASCSU will vote on whether to receive or refer the GE Task Force Report at their meeting in May, which occurs after our last Senate meeting.

5. Updates from the Administrators:

a. From the Provost:
The committee discussed the ASCSU and the GE Task Force Report. Concern was expressed about the procedural value of the report and the lack of input by the Chancellor and CSU administrators. A member suggested that a group was asked to look at GE and did so for two years, and now is the time to begin consultation with the administration. A member suggested that would be better received if everyone was aware that was the process.

There are over 500 President's Scholars that plan on attending the Honors Convocation; they still have until Friday to confirm attendance.

The Provost Office has released 75 tenure/tenure-track faculty searches for Fall 2019. The university had a very successful hiring season. There were several very rich pools. Some of the deans requested permission to hire more than one candidate from the same pool. The College of Business was particularly successful with hiring this Fall.

The COACHE Survey has over a 55% response rate now. This is higher than all other institutions. The Provost hopes to put something out to the campus by the end of the semester.

b. From the VP of Administration and Finance:
The VPAF recently attended an award ceremony hosted by the University Police Department (UPD) in honor of one of our students as well as the dispatcher and officers that saved the life of a faculty member who suffered a heart attack recently. VPAF Faas commented on what a spectacular event it was.

The VPAF recently toured the new Spartan Recreation and Aquatics Center (SRAC). It is an "amazing facility," and VP Faas encouraged everyone to visit the SRAC. A member asked if members would have the option of opting out of hand scanning with another alternative such as presenting their ID Card. VP Faas will check into this a report back.

There are two finalists for beverage pouring rights on campus. A member asked if we had to have soda. The committee discussed that a decision not to have soda on campus would take away an enormous amount of money that could be used for things such as books for the library, etc. In addition, they aren't just serving soda. There are flavored waters and teas.

The committee discussed the conversion of the South Campus track into a parking garage. Parking is a constant problem for SJSU. We must have parking at South campus. The Sharks and Giants will use the garage on the weekends and at night. We will not schedule events when we know

they have games, and they will not schedule events when we have games. This will give us an additional 1,500 parking spots to use.

6. The meeting adjourned at 1:32 p.m.

These minutes were taken and transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on April 10, 2019. The minutes were edited by Chair Frazier on April 15, 2019 and approved by the Executive Committee on April 15, 2019.

Consent Calendar 22-Apr-19

	Committee	Last Name/First Name	Zip	Term	Phone	College/Seat
ADD:						
	GS&R	Cheng, Cheng	0028	EXO	cheng.chen	, Library Collection
REMOVE:						
	GS&R	Chan, Emily	0028	EXO	82044	r, Library Collection

San José State University
Academic Senate
Organization and Government Committee **AS 1735**
April 22, 2019
First Reading

Policy Recommendation
Amendment A to University Policy F15-13
General Education Advisory Committee

Legislative History: F15-13 (Updating the Board of General Studies Membership, Charge, and Responsibilities) rescinded S96-9 and S02-7 and is our current policy articulating the membership, charge, and responsibilities for the Board of General Studies (BOGS).

Whereas, Location of the committee reviewing proposals for GE courses within the infrastructure of university committees has been reviewed by the Organization and Government Committee, and

Whereas, The membership and responsibilities of such a committee indicates it is best situated as an operating committee reporting to the Curriculum and Research Committee, and

Whereas: This change is consistent with EO 1100, therefore be it

Resolved: That F15-13 be amended as provided in this recommendation, and be it further

Resolved: That the Academic Senate, in AY 2019-2020, should direct the GEAC to conduct the next full review of the current Guidelines for GE, AI, and GWAR, and be it further

Resolved: That updates to the current General Education Guidelines reflect the changes documented here.

Rationale: The Board of General Studies (BOGS) is presently constituted as a committee under the category “other” with no direct reporting responsibilities to the Curriculum and Research Policy Committee. Neither its membership nor its responsibilities calls for the board to reside outside the infrastructure of University committees. With one representative from each of the academic colleges, a student, and appropriate ex-officio members it can and should be an operating committee reporting to the Curriculum and Research policy committee.

An external review of our GE program recommended the need for program level assessment. An SJSU GE assessment task force is currently engaged in discussions that should lead to a robust strategy for assessment of program-level GE learning outcomes. Periodic review of GE courses can be done in the same manner as courses in the major through the program planning process.

A full review of the current guidelines for General Education, American Institutions, and Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement is expected in AY 2019-2020. Therefore, changes needed as a result of this proposal can readily be addressed.

Approved:	4/15/19
Vote:	8-0-2
Present:	French, Grosvenor, Capizzi, Higgins, McClory, Millora Ormsbee, Rodan, Saldamli, Shifflett
Absent:	Curry, Gallo
Financial Impact:	None
Workload Impact:	Reduction in workload for the GE advisory committee. Additional coordination between the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate and the GEAC chair; additional coordination between the Program Planning Committee chair and GEAC chair. Potential increase in workload for Program Planning Committee. Decrease in workload for college offices that would otherwise conduct elections.

Reference information for the Senate:
http://www.sjsu.edu/senate/docs/F15-13.pdf
http://www.sjsu.edu/gup/ugs/faculty/ge/guidelines/index.html
http://info.sjsu.edu/web-dbgen/narr/catalog/rec-16334.16540.16541.html
http://www.sjsu.edu/gup/ugs/faculty/ge/getaskforce/index.html
https://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1100-rev-8-23-17.html (see section 6.2.2 & 6.2.5)
External reviewers report

Recommended Amendments
~~Board of General Studies~~ General Education Advisory Committee
Membership, Charge, and Responsibilities

1. ~~Board of General Studies~~ **General Education Advisory Committee**

The General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC) shall be an operating committee reporting to the Curriculum and Research Policy Committee. Executive order 1100 (which superseded EO 1065) provides guidance on a range of issues including implementation and governance pertaining to CSU General Education Breadth Requirements. Specifically, section 6.2.2 ~~3~~ notes that "each campus shall have a broadly representative GE committee, a majority of which shall be instructional faculty and shall also include student membership. The committee will provide oversight and make recommendations concerning the implementation, conduct, and evaluation of requirements specified in this executive order. As a companion to the GE committee, a campus may choose to establish a GE program assessment committee to conduct the work described in 6.2.5 of this executive order."

1.1 Charge

~~BOGS~~ The GEAC ~~receives and solicits courses and~~ reviews curricular proposals designed to satisfy General Education (GE), American Institutions (AI), and Graduation Writing Assessment Requirements (GWAR) requirements from all colleges and departments of the University; provides support to departments seeking to develop GE, AI, or GWAR proposals; ~~reviews,~~ approves~~, and authorizes~~ new ~~courses and~~ curricular proposals for purposes of GE, AI, and GWAR; and evaluates the ~~courses and~~ curricula proposed ~~it has approved~~ according to procedures described in the current ~~2014~~ GE Guidelines. The ~~Board~~ GEAC evaluates modifications requested by degree programs in accordance with the current ~~2014~~ Guidelines.

1.2 Membership. Whenever possible, faculty appointments should be made on the basis of interest, competence, and experience teaching General Education curricula. College faculty representatives shall be tenured. The at-large faculty seats should be used to provide the committee with expertise in areas of general education not covered by college faculty representatives. At large seats can be filled with non-tenured faculty and/or lecturers.

AVP ~~Graduate &~~ Undergraduate Studies ~~Programs~~ or designee (EXO, non voting)
Director of Assessment (EXO, non voting)
1 faculty Business
1 faculty Education
1 faculty Engineering
1 faculty Health and Human Sciences
1 faculty Humanities & the Arts
1 faculty Science
1 faculty Social Sciences
0 to 3 faculty-at-large (GE area representatives)
1 Student

1.2.1 ~~Election and~~ Appointment of Members

1.2.1.1 ~~The faculty members of the Board shall be elected by the faculty electorate in each college in an election administered by the Dean's office. Each department in a college shall be informed of a pending election and shall nominate one tenured faculty member.~~

Each non-ex officio faculty member will initially serve a 3-year term renewable for one additional 3-year term. Faculty can return to serve in future years (after a break in service) when a seat becomes available. Student members serve a one-year term and can be re-appointed. Recruitment of applicants to serve on the GEAC will be done through the normal Committee on Committees process for the seats designated for a faculty member and student. Each person seeking nomination shall prepare a brief (not more than 100 words) statement summarizing her/his experience (including GE area of teaching) and interest in General Education.

When there are multiple applications for a seat, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate will select individuals to serve. Selection of faculty shall be based on interest, competence, and experience teaching in the General Education curricula; selection shall also consider the need to have GE areas represented. Student appointments should be made on the basis of interest, experience in the General Education curricula, and a scholastic record of academic excellence.

When a seat will be vacant for no more than 1 semester (e.g., sabbatical or leave of absence) an interim appointment can be made following normal Committee on Committee processes. Any seat that will be vacant for a year or more will require a replacement for the remainder of the term associated with that seat.

~~1.2.1.2 Prior to the departmental nomination, each person seeking nomination shall prepare and circulate to the department faculty a brief (not more than 100 words) statement summarizing her/his experience and objectives in General Education.~~

~~1.2.1.3 The college curriculum committee shall select not more than three of those nominated to place before the college electorate. The college curriculum committee may choose to meet and consult with the Provost (or designee) prior to making the selection.~~

~~1.2.1.4 Selection by each college curriculum committee shall be based on interest, competence, and experience in the General Education curricula; the statements prepared by departmental nominees shall be considered.~~
~~1.2.1.5. Faculty shall serve three-year staggered terms. When a full-term vacancy is to be filled, or a vacancy for an unexpired term of more than one year, applications shall be solicited from the college, and an election held as provided above.~~

~~1.2.1.6. Vacancies of one year or less shall be filled for the balance of the unexpired term. The college curriculum committee in consultation with the Dean shall select a member to fill the vacancy. Consideration shall be given to, among others, those who applied for the last vacancy for which college-wide solicitation was required.~~

~~1.2.1.7. A faculty member of the Board may be granted a leave for one semester. A one semester interim appointment may then be made as provided in 1.2.1.6.~~
~~1.2.1.8. If a college is unable to elect a faculty member to the Board, then the position will be filled for one year by the college curriculum committee in consultation with the Dean.~~

~~1.2.1.9. Student appointments should be made on the basis of interest, experience in the General Education curricula, and a scholastic record of academic excellence. Student members of the Board shall be appointed by the Provost in consultation with the elected members of the Executive Committee and the Associated Students President.~~

~~1.2.1.10. Student appointees shall serve one-year terms and may seek independent study credit by working with the Chair of BOGS.~~

1.2.2 ~~The Chair shall be a faculty member with at least one year of service on the Board. College faculty representatives through a vote will select the chair from among those with continuing appointments before the end of the spring semester for the subsequent year.~~ The chair will be a tenured faculty member from the committee, with at least one year of service on GEAC, selected each spring by faculty members with continuing appointments for the subsequent year. ~~appointed by the Provost in consultation with the Senate Executive Committee.~~

1.2.3 Ex officio members will be non-voting members with the exception that in the case of ties, the AVP or his/her designee to the committee may vote.

1.2.4 If a member is absent from three regularly scheduled committee meetings in an academic year the chair of the GEAC ~~BOGS~~ may request that the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate initiate action leading to the ~~election~~ appointment of a new member. If a member repeatedly does not perform assigned committee duties, the chair of the GEAC ~~BOGS~~ may request that the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate initiate action leading to the appointment ~~election~~ of a new member.

~~1.3~~ 2.0 **Responsibilities of the General Education Advisory Committee** ~~Board of General Studies~~

~~1.3. The GEAC Board shall report to the Curriculum and Research Policy Committee Provost and Vice President for~~ Academic ~~Affairs.~~

2.1 Members are expected to carry out their responsibilities in an unbiased, respectful, and collegial manner.

2.2 ~~1.3.2~~ Members are expected to know the current Guidelines for GE, AI, and GWAR.

2.3 ~~1.3.3~~ As needed, the GEAC ~~Board~~ ~~shall~~ may ~~actively~~ solicit ~~courses and~~ curricular proposals ~~designed~~ to satisfy General Education requirements from all colleges and departments of the University. It shall review and, where appropriate, approve new ~~courses and~~ curricular proposals ~~for purposes of General Education, and shall evaluate existing GE, AI, and GWAR courses and curricula~~ in a timely manner.

2.4 ~~1.3.4~~ The committee ~~Board~~, in consultation with the appropriate college deans and department chairpersons, shall provide for and ~~approve~~ recommend to the Curriculum

and Research Committee modifications to requirements requested by degree programs in accordance with the ~~2014~~ current Guidelines.

2.5 ~~1.3.5~~ Policy proposals affecting General Education curricula shall be brought to the Academic Senate by the Curriculum and Research Committee. The Organization and Government Committee shall present policy proposals relating to charge, membership, and responsibilities of the GEAC ~~BOGS~~.

2.6 ~~1.3.6~~ Annually, early in Fall Semester, the ~~Board~~ GEAC chair will provide for the Senate (through Curriculum and Research Committee) a written report on its activities for the preceding academic year.

~~2.7 1.3.7 In accordance with the 2014 Guidelines, BOGS is responsible for the assessment and continuing certification of GE, AI, and GWAR courses.~~

2.7 The GEAC is encouraged to liaise with SJSU GE coordinators, college curriculum committees, and the CSU GE Advisory Council to facilitate communication as needed.

2.8 As part of its program planning process, the GEAC will review the current guidelines for GE, AI, and GWAR. The GEAC ~~is encouraged to~~ shall solicit input from campus stakeholders and take into consideration the feedback from ~~WASC,~~ the most recent program plan and external reviewer's report. Any proposed modifications shall be forwarded to C&R for final review, and consideration by the Senate, before implementation.

3.0 ~~1.4~~ **Procedures**

3.1 ~~1.4.1~~ Meetings of the ~~Board~~ committee shall be open to the campus community, except in cases where the GEAC ~~BOGS~~ elects to conduct votes in closed session.

3.2 ~~1.4.2~~ Departmental representatives (normally course coordinators and chairs/directors) shall be invited in a timely manner by the GEAC ~~BOGS~~ to attend, as needed, ~~Board~~ meetings at which their course(s) will be discussed. No vote to reject a proposal shall be taken until departmental representatives have been invited to a discussion of their proposal.

3.3 ~~1.4.3~~ At the committee's ~~Board's~~ discretion, discipline-specific faculty will be invited to participate in discussions concerning proposals when the GEAC ~~board~~ determines additional expertise is needed.

3.4 ~~1.4.4~~ The GEAC ~~Board~~ may appoint ad hoc General Education Review Panels (GRP) ~~Advisory Panels (GEAPs).~~ Each GRP shall be focused on a specific curricular requirement or set of requirements that is under the purview of the GEAC ~~Board~~. The creation of GRPs shall be at the discretion of the committee ~~Board~~, except for the American Institutions GRP which is required. A GRP may be ~~an ad hoc group~~

constituted for the short duration needed to review and subsequently advise the GEAC ~~Board~~ on specific proposals. ~~pertaining to certification or continuing certification~~.

3.4.1 ~~1.4.4.1~~ Purpose. A GRP shall provide the GEAC ~~Board~~ with advice drawn from disciplinary expertise and may assist the committee ~~Board~~ with the workload associated with reviewing ~~and assessing~~ courses associated with a particular curricular requirement.

3.4.2 ~~1.4.4.2~~ Membership. The membership of Review ~~Advisory~~ Panels shall be determined by the ~~Board~~ GEAC but shall be no less than three persons, and shall consist of individuals with subject-matter expertise and teaching experience relevant to the particular curricular requirement. The GEAC chair will work with the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate to organize outreach to constitute a GRP.

3.4.2.1 ~~1.4.4.3~~ American Institutions. The American Institutions GRP shall include, at a minimum, a representative with a doctorate in Political Science who specializes in American and California Government, a representative with a doctorate in History who specializes in United States History, and a representative who has taught American Institutions requirements in an interdisciplinary context outside of the Political Science and History departments. The AI review panel may advise the GEAC ~~Board~~ on the GE content of curricular proposals that seek to meet both AI and GE requirements, and it will advise the GEAC ~~Board~~ on the AI content of all curricular proposals that seek to meet AI requirements. The GEAC ~~Board~~ will strongly consider the panel's advice. In the event that the GEAC ~~Board~~ rules differently than the AI panel, the GEAC ~~board~~ will provide the rationale for its ruling and members of the review panel may appeal the ruling to the Curriculum and Research Committee for a final decision.

3.4.3 ~~1.4.5~~ If the GEAC ~~Board~~ proposes to reject ~~denies~~ ~~certification~~ ~~of~~ a new course proposal, it shall provide the course coordinator and C&R with written feedback, explaining the ~~reasons for a recommendation~~ decision not to approve. ~~denial. If the Board recommends to the Curriculum and Research (C&R) Committee that a course be decertified, it shall provide C&R and the course coordinator with written feedback explaining the reasons for the recommended decertification. For both new and continuing certification,~~ The GEAC ~~Board~~ may not raise in subsequent proceedings on the same course additional objections, except those that apply to new materials submitted. Final decisions regarding rejection of a new course proposal rest with the Curriculum and Research Committee.

3.4.4 ~~1.4.6~~ If the GEAC ~~Board~~ proposes guidelines regarding criteria for certification ~~or continuing certification~~ in addition to those prescribed by University policy, these guidelines shall be submitted to the Curriculum and Research Committee for policy review and will subsequently be made available to all course coordinators.

3.4.5 ~~1.4.7~~ The GEAC ~~Board~~ may make additional rules for the conduct of its proceedings, but they must be consistent with University policy.

3.4.6 Program Planning and GEAC. GE courses will be periodically reviewed through the program planning process in the same manner as courses in the major. While the GEAC is not directly involved in this review, the Program Planning committee can seek the advice of the GEAC where concerns are raised in the program planning review process.

4.0 ~~1.5~~. **Assessment of General Education Program**

4.1 ~~1.5.1~~ The GEAC will be consulted as GE program-level learning outcomes are developed or modified.

4.2 In collaboration with the Director for Assessment, and any other entity charged with assessment of the General Education Program overall, GEAC, as needed, will be consulted regarding plans for assessment of the GE program as expressed in EO 1100 section 6.2.5.

~~5.0 2. Subsequent Review of Guidelines -~~ Deleted this section but information relocated to resolved and section 2.8

~~5.1 The Academic Senate, in AY 2019-2020, should direct the GEAC Board of General Studies to conduct the next full review of the Guidelines for GE, AI, and GWAR.~~

~~5.2 The GEAC is encouraged to take into consideration the feedback from WASC, the program plan, and the external reviewer's report.~~

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY **AS 1736**
Academic Senate
Curriculum and Research Committee
April 22, 2019
Final Reading

Policy Recommendation

Amendment A to University Policy S14-9, Guidelines for Concentrations

Whereas: Executive Order 1071 indicates that "an option, concentration, or special emphasis (or similar subprogram) must constitute less than one half of the units required in the major program", and

Whereas: An FAQ was created for EO1071 that clarifies some of the language in the EO, and

Whereas: University policy S14-9 stipulates that concentrations at both the undergraduate and graduate level "must have at least 30% similarity"; therefore, be it

Resolved: That the following amendment be adopted to replace Section I.A, I.B, and IV.B to bring university policy S14-9 into compliance with EO1071.

Approved: April 15, 2019

Vote: 10-0-0

Present: Thalia Anagnos, Marc d'Alarcao, David Emmert, Cynthia Fernandez-Rios, Susanna Khavul, Cara Maffini, Wynn Schultz-Krohn, Pamela Stacks, Lynne Trulio, Brandon White

Absent: Anand Ramasubramanian, Gwendolyn Mok

Workload Impact: A temporary increase in workload at department, college, and university level for curriculum committees, chairs, associate deans and Undergraduate Studies office staff as programs become compliant.

Financial Impact: None anticipated

Amendment A to University Policy S14-9, Guidelines for Concentrations

~~I. Curricula Requirements for Concentrations~~

I. Curricula Requirements

A. Undergraduate Degrees

~~1. Concentrations within a degree program must have at least 30% similarity in the preparation for the major among the base major and all concentrations in the degree program.~~

~~2. Concentrations within a degree program must have at least 30% similarity in the core courses among the base major and all concentrations in the degree program.~~

~~3. Concentrations within a degree program must have at least 30% similarity in the major's courses among the base major and all concentrations in the degree program.~~

~~4. At least 10% of the units for the degree must be a unique set of requirements for that concentration.~~

1. Options, Concentrations, Special emphases or other similar subprograms represent less than 50 percent of the major requirements within a degree program. Major requirements may include preparation for the major.

2. At least 12 units for the options, concentrations, special emphases or other similar subprograms must be a unique set of requirements for the degree.

B. Graduate Degrees

~~1. Concentrations within a degree program must have at least 30% similarity in core coursework requirements for the master's degree among the base major and all concentrations within the degree, not including culminating experience (project, portfolio, or 299) units.~~

1. Options, Concentrations, Special emphases or other similar subprograms represent less than 50 percent of the major requirements within a degree program.

2. At least 8 units for the options, concentrations, special emphases or other similar subprograms must be a unique set of requirements for the degree.

IV. Existing Concentrations

A. The Office of Undergraduate Studies and ~~Graduate Studies & Research~~ College of Graduate Studies will evaluate existing concentrations (those approved in Spring 2014 or earlier) to determine whether they conform with the curricular requirements of Section I.

~~B. For existing concentrations that fail to conform with the curricular requirements of Section I, the college curriculum committee and Dean must inform the Offices of Undergraduate Studies or Graduate Studies & Research by the end of the Fall 2016 semester whether they approve of the existing concentrations being "grandfathered" in. If the college curriculum committee and Dean do not approve the concentration, it will be discontinued.~~

B. For existing options, concentrations, special emphases or other similar subprograms that fail to conform with the curricular requirements of Section I, the department will bring those programs into compliance by the start of the next program review process.

SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY **AS 1737**
Academic Senate
Curriculum and Research Committee
April 22, 2019
First Reading

Policy Recommendation
Blended Bachelor's and Master's Programs

Whereas: Coded Memorandum AA-2012-01 specifies the minimum requirements for establishing a "blended degree model", and

Whereas: No current university policy exists to guide the development of a blended bachelor's degree to master's degree program at San José State University, and

Whereas: The blending of bachelor's and master's degrees would support students in the pursuit of advanced degrees in the same or different fields, and

Whereas: Adopting this model may streamline students' pathway to completing the master's degree program, and

Whereas: Title 5 requires completion of a minimum of 120 units for a bachelor's degree and a minimum of 30 units for a master's degree, and

Whereas: The decision to offer a blended bachelor's and master's degree would be exclusively the decision of the department/school faculty with curricular approval following normal SJSU processes; therefore, be it

Resolved: That programs interested in establishing a blended bachelor's to master's degree be allowed to offer the blended program as described in this policy.

Approved: 03/18/2019

Vote: 9-0-1

Present: Thalia Anagnos, Marc d'Alarcao, David Emmert, Cynthia Fernandez-Rios, Susana Khavul, Cara Maffini, Winifred Schultz-Krohn, Pam Stacks, Lynne Trulio, Brandon White

Absent: Anand Ramasubramanian, Gwendolyn Mok

Workload Impact: A temporary increase in workload at department, college, and university level for curriculum committees, chairs, associate deans,

	Undergraduate Studies staff and College of Graduate Studies staff as programs develop curriculum and application processes for blended degree programs.
	A significant increase in workload is anticipated for GAPE, registrar's office, and financial aid staff members to develop business processes and PeopleSoft applications for tracking and implementation.
Financial Impact:	None anticipated

I. Academic Objectives of a Blended Bachelor's and Master's Program

1. To provide an accelerated route to a graduate professional degree, with simultaneous award of both bachelor's and master's degrees.
2. To enhance the undergraduate learning experience.
3. To provide a seamless process whereby students (first time freshman or transfer) can progress from undergraduate to graduate status without having to apply through the Admissions Office.
4. To enable a senior project capstone experience to be integrated with a graduate thesis/project.

II. Establishment of a Blended Bachelor's and Master's Program

Academic units that choose to establish a blended program must follow the normal curricular review process. A blended program must meet the following minimum criteria:

1. Title 5 requires the completion of a minimum of 120 units for a Bachelor's degree and a minimum of 30 units for a Master's degree. Thus, a minimum of 150 units are required for a blended program. In a given situation where a Master's degree exceeds 30 units, the curriculum could be designed such that the excess units would be absorbed into the undergraduate portion of the blended program as "blended" units. The blended policy, therefore, differs from university policy S89-2 on graduate credit for undergraduates, which permits students to take as many as 6 units of graduate work in their last undergraduate semester and apply those units (via petition, and only if those units are not counted towards undergraduate requirements) to a subsequent graduate program.
2. Academic units may only implement programs blending existing bachelor's and master's degree programs in the same support mode (e.g. all self-support or all stateside-support).
3. Curricula for the blended bachelor's and master's programs must adhere to existing campus curriculum policies for both bachelor's and master's degrees.
4. The College of Graduate Studies, Undergraduate Studies and the Registrar shall develop guidelines and processes for administration of the blended degrees.

III. Admission to the Blended Bachelor's and Master's Program

1. Individual programs will develop the criteria for admission as well as the degree roadmap for completion of the blended degree programs.
2. The process for applying to the blended program will be internal to the university.
3. To apply to the program, the student must successfully have completed a minimum of 60 undergraduate degree applicable units (including all lower division units) and not exceed a maximum of 120 undergraduate degree

applicable units. Departments may require more than 60 undergraduate degree applicable units before students may apply to the blended degree program.

4. The blended bachelor's and master's program must include blended units. Blended units are graduate-level courses required for the master's degree which students in a blended program may take while in undergraduate status.

IV. Change to Graduate Status in the Blended Program

1. Students in the blended Bachelor's and Master's program do not apply for the graduate program through Cal State Apply. As noted above in Section III.2, students will apply internally to the university to the blended degree program.
2. A minimum of 2.5 GPA in the last 60 semester units attempted is required. Once admitted to graduate standing, students must maintain an overall 3.0 GPA or better in courses that appear on the Formal Study Plan and adhere to all graduate policies and procedures.
3. Completion of the undergraduate Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) is required before a student can transition to graduate status.
4. A student must complete 120 degree-applicable units (undergraduate or graduate).
5. All lower division undergraduate coursework shall be completed prior to approval of graduate status.
6. The registrar's office in consultation with College of Graduate Studies shall develop processes for transitioning students from undergraduate to graduate status.

V. Award of Degrees

1. The student applies to graduate for the bachelor's degree the semester before the student will complete the bachelor's degree requirements. Upon evaluation of the bachelor's degree requirements, if the student has satisfied all requirements for the bachelor's degree, the degree will be awarded.
2. If a student admitted into a blended program opts out of, or fails to complete, the master's degree portion of the program, graduate level coursework already counted towards completion of the undergraduate degree may not be used towards the completion of a subsequent master's degree, even if admitted for a future term.

San José State University
Academic Senate
Organization and Government Committee **AS 1738**
April 22, 2019
Final Reading

Senate Management Resolution
Amending Bylaw 5, Membership of the Committee on Committees

Legislative History: The charge and membership information for the Committee on Committees reside in Bylaws 5 which was recently updated with SM-S19-1.

Whereas: Following approval of SM-S19-1 it was found that qualifying language regarding the membership of the Committee on Committees, from the original bylaw 5, needed to be included, therefore be it

Resolved Bylaw 5.2 be amended as follows:

Membership: The Senate's Associate Vice chair serves as chair for the Committee on Committees. Additionally, one faculty member from each of the Senate's representative units ~~from which faculty representatives are elected,~~ who shall ~~be faculty members entitled to vote in their respective units, but~~ not be members of the Senate. If a seat is not filled and becomes an 'at large' seat, Senators from the college where there is a vacancy, who are already serving on a policy committee, would be eligible to serve on the Committee on Committees.

Senate Associate Vice Chair [EXO] chair
1 faculty, College of Business
1 faculty, College of Education
1 faculty, College of Engineering
1 faculty, College of Health and Human Sciences
1 faculty, College of Humanities & Arts
1 faculty, College of Science
1 faculty, College of Social Science
1 Member, General Unit
1 Student Senator

Rationale: This clarifies that the AVC is the chair and that (as had been in the bylaws), faculty representing their college are not members of the Senate. A stipulation to allow senators to serve was added to accommodate interest in allowing senators to serve on this committee.

Approved:	April 15, 2019
Vote:	10-0-0
Present:	French, Grosvenor, Ormsbee, Higgins, Millora, McClory, Rodan, Shifflett, Capizzi, Saldamli,
Absent:	Curry, Gallo
Financial Impact:	None
Workload Impact:	None

San José State University
Academic Senate
Organization and Government Committee **AS 1740**
April 22, 2019
First Reading

Policy Recommendation
Amendment A to University Policy S17-4, Membership of the Student Success Committee

Legislative History: The charge and membership information for the student success committee was last updated with S17-4 (Change in Membership, Charge, and Category for the Student Success Committee).
.

Whereas: Administrative changes eliminating the position of AVP for Student and Faculty Success have been made, and

Whereas: The person in that position was a member and co-chair of the Student and Faculty Success Committee, therefore be it

Resolved That S17-4 be amended to reflect these changes:

Membership:
AVP Transition & Retention Services (EXO)
~~AVP Student and Faculty Success~~ (EXO) AVP Administration and Enrollment Services
1 Representative from Academic Affairs - appointed by VP Academic Affairs (EXO)
1 Representative from Student Affairs - appointed by VP Student Affairs (EXO)
1 Graduate/undergraduate student
2 Undergraduate students
5 faculty

The student success committee will be co-chaired by the ~~AVP Student and Faculty Success~~ AVP Administration and Enrollment Services and a faculty member selected by the committee members.

Rationale: This updates the membership to address the vacancy resulting from administrative changes.

Approved:	April 15, 2019
Vote:	9-1-0
Present:	French, Grosvenor, Ormsbee, Higgins, Millora, McClory, Rodan, Shifflett, Capizzi, Saldamli,
Absent:	Curry, Gallo
Financial Impact:	None
Workload Impact:	None

San Jose State University
Academic Senate
Instruction & Student Affairs Committee **AS 1741**
April 22, 2019
First Reading

Policy Recommendation
Rescind F75-6, Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) Requirement for Resident Alien Students

Legislative History: The Academic Senate at its meeting of November 24, 1975, passed F75-6 as a resolution on the TOEFL requirement for applicants who were neither citizens educated in the U.S. nor "foreign" students. The specific student group targeted in this policy was called "Resident Aliens," i.e., permanent residents granted an immigration visa. They did not fall into either the category of citizens educated in the U.S. or international students and were thus exempt by default from the admission requirements applied to these two groups. Because a permanent resident was not required to present evidence of English proficiency, such a student was often admitted to the University without proof of adequate language skills to succeed in their academic program. Therefore, it was resolved that permanent residents who graduated from a "foreign" high school be required to achieve a minimum score of 500 on the TOEFL and further resolved that this requirement may be waived in the Admissions Office if the applicant met certain well defined criteria indicating English language proficiency.

In the course of the Organization and Government Policy Committee's review of senate policies during Fall 2017, the Instruction and Student Affairs Policy Committee was tasked with reviewing and updating F75-6 in accordance with current University policies and practices.

Whereas: The language in F75-6 is outdated, and

Whereas: This policy was specific to permanent residents only, and

Whereas: This policy makes reference to citizenship status which is irrelevant, and

Whereas: This policy does not mention any English Proficiency Tests other than TOEFL, and

Whereas: This policy does not concur with Sections 40752.1, 40802.1, and 41040 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations specifying the CSU English language requirements for applicants or Executive Order 975: Policy Governing the English Language Examination (https://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-975.html), and therefore be it

Resolved That University Policy F75-6 be rescinded and replaced with the following.

English Language Proficiency Requirement for SJSU applicants

This policy is driven by the following principals:

- Having a strong understanding of the English language is important for success at SJSU;
- It is important to demonstrate evidence of language proficiency prior to being admitted into the University; and
- All interfaces should have consistent language, including all University promotional material, informational literature and websites;

Undergraduate Students:

The following undergraduate applicants (including transfer applicants) are required to submit a score of 500 or above on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) to the Office of Undergraduate Admissions:

- who have graduated from a secondary or high school in a country where English is not the primary language or,
- who have not attended school at the secondary level or above for at least 3 years full time where English is the principal language of instruction

Some majors may require a score higher than the campus minimum. Alternative methods, such as the International English Language Testing System (IELTS), Pearson Test of English (PTE), or other comparable tests assessing English fluency may also be used.

Post-baccalaureate and Graduate Students:

The following post-baccalaureate or graduate applicants are required to submit a score of 550 or above on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) to the Office of Graduate Admissions:

- who come from a country where English is not the primary language or,
- who do not possess a baccalaureate degree from a post-secondary institution where English is the principal language of instruction.

Some majors may require a score higher than the campus minimum. Alternative methods, such as the International English Language Testing System (IELTS), Pearson Test of English (PTE), or other comparable tests assessing English fluency may also be used.

This requirement may be waived in the Offices of Undergraduate and Graduate Admissions if the applicant meets one or more of the following criteria:

1. The applicant has completed three years or more of study at a secondary or high school in the U.S.

2. The applicant has completed 60 semester/90 quarter transferable units at an accredited college or university in the U.S.
3. The applicant has studied full-time at a U.S. college or university for at least three years.
4. The department chair requests that a waiver be granted after consultation with the College of Professional and Global Education to assess English language proficiency.