

**SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE**

**2015/2016**

**Agenda**

**October 5, 2015, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm**

**Engineering 285/287**

- I. Call to Order and Roll Call –**
- II. Approval of Minutes –  
Senate Minutes of September 14, 2015**
- III. Communications and Questions**
  - A. From the Chair of the Senate
  - B. From the President of the University
- IV. State of the University Announcements:**
  - A. Provost
  - B. Vice President for Administration and Finance
  - C. Vice President for Student Affairs
  - D. Associated Students President
  - E. Vice President for University Advancement
  - F. Statewide Academic Senators
- V. Executive Committee Report**
  - A. Minutes of the Executive Committee –  
**Exec. Minutes of August 31, 2015**  
**Exec. Minutes of September 21, 2015**
  - B. Consent Calendar –
  - C. Executive Committee Action Items –  
**Approval of the Election Calendar for 2016**
- VI. Unfinished Business –**
- VII. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation):**
  - A. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):  
***AS 1581, Policy Recommendation, Instructor Drops in Online Courses (Final Reading)***  
  
***AS 1582, Policy Recommendation, Academic Integrity (First Reading)***
  - B. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

- C. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):  
***AS 1584, Policy Recommendation, Rescinding Outdated Policy S98-11, Related to the 1998 GE Guidelines (Final Reading)***  
  
***AS 1578, Policy Recommendation, Revision to the SJSU Strategic Planning Policy (First Reading)***  
  
***AS 1579, Policy Recommendation, Budget Advisory Committee (First Reading)***  
  
***AS 1551, Policy Recommendation, Modification of the Writing Requirements Committee Membership (Final Reading)***  
  
***AS 1585, Policy Recommendation, Updating the Board of General Studies Membership, Charge, and Responsibilities (First Reading)***  
  
***AS 1586, Policy Recommendation, Modification of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board Membership (First Reading)***  
  
***AS 1587, Senate Management Resolution, Dissolving the Heritage, Preservation, and Public History Committee (Final Reading)***  
  
***AS 1588, Policy Recommendation, Faculty Athletics Representative Policy (First Reading)***
- D. University Library Board (ULB):
- E. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):  
***AS 1580, Policy Recommendation, Credit by Exam for Challenge Examinations (Final Reading)***  
  
***AS 1583, Policy Recommendation, Internships and Service Learning (First Reading)***

**VIII. Special Committee Reports:**

***Academic Affairs Budget Update by Marna Genes, AVP Academic Budgets and Planning, Time Certain: 3:30 p.m.***

**IX. New Business:**

**X. Adjournment:**

2015/2016 Academic Senate

MINUTES  
September 14, 2015

**I. The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Forty-Seven Senators were present.**

**Ex Officio:**

Present: Kimbarow, Heiden, Sabalius,  
Amante, Van Selst, Lee

**CASA Representatives:**

Present: Schultz-Krohn, Lee, Shifflett, Grosvenor, Sen

**Administrative Representatives:**

Present: Martin, Feinstein, Blaylock,  
Larochelle, Lanning

**COB Representatives:**

Present: Campsey, Sibley, Virick

**Deans:**

Present: Green, Hsu, Steele  
Absent: Stacks

**EDUC Representatives:**

Present: Mathur  
Absent: Laker

**Students:**

Present: El-Miaari, Abukhdeir,  
Medrano, Cuellar, Gay  
Absent: Sarra

**ENGR Representatives:**

Present: Backer, Sullivan-Green

**H&A Representatives:**

Present: Frazier, Bacich, Grindstaff, Riley, Khan

**Alumni Representative:**

Present: Walters

**SCI Representatives:**

Present: Kaufman, White, Beyersdorf, Clements

**Emeritus Representative:**

Present: Buzanski

**SOS Representatives:**

Present: Peter, Coopman, Curry, Wilson

**General Unit Representatives:**

Present: Matoush, Kauppila  
Absent: Medina

**II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–**

The minutes of May 11, 2015 (last minutes of 2014-2015 Senate) were approved as is (41-0-6).

The minutes of May 11, 2015 (first minutes of 2015-2016 Senate) were approved as is (39-0-8).

**III. Communications and Questions –**

**A. From the Chair of the Senate:**

Chair Kimbarow welcomed the Senate back from summer break.

This Senate has broken a record by having nine resolutions come to the floor on the first full Senate meeting of Fall, and if this is any indication of the year to come it will be extremely busy compared to last Fall when the Senate passed only two resolutions.

Chair Kimbarow welcomed the new Senators: Senators Martin, Blaylock, Lanning,

Hsu, Beyersdorf, Clements, and Cuellar.

Chair Kimbarow recognized the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, and informed all new Senators that they could go to Eva with any questions they might have.

Last year the Senate passed 12 new policies including the Retention-Tenure-Promotion (RTP), Writing Skills, Library, Probation and Disqualification, Priority Registration, and Sound Level policies. However, the most popular policy of all those passed last year was the Thanksgiving policy which takes effect next year and makes students the Wednesday before Thanksgiving a non-instructional day.

One policy remained unsigned from last year and that is the Credit by Exam policy. It remained unsigned due to the need to revise it to make it in compliance with CSU policy. It is coming back today for a First Reading.

The Senate passed a number of Sense of the Senate Resolutions last year and a few that stand out include the resolution that endorsed the Statement on Shared Governance and the resolution addressing the need to increase the proportion of tenured and tenure-track faculty at San José State University.

Two new national searches will be conducted this year to find the new President and the new Vice President of Finance and Administration. The Chief Diversity Officer search from last year has been extended to the end of this year, following the selection of the permanent President.

The Senate will be voting this afternoon to select the two faculty representatives that will serve with Chair Kimbarow on the Presidential Search Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees. The university is also conducting 66 faculty searches in departments across the campus.

Chair Kimbarow announced that Associated Students has filled every single committee across campus that has students on it.

When faculty, staff, students, and administration work together everything is possible and we can achieve great things. Chair Kimbarow looks forward to May 2016 when he can look back and see everything the campus community has accomplished this year.

**B. From the President of the University –**

President Martin announced she was thrilled to be at the first Academic Senate meeting and will try to attend as much as she possibly can. She thanked the Executive Committee for being so welcoming.

President Martin said that one of the things WASC wanted addressed is a solid leadership team. The President and the leadership team will work hard this year to get the new strategic plan for 2017 ready, as well as work on strengthening the university. President Martin will be the voice for the campus in Long Beach.

Student success is a priority for the university and we are seeing progress, but there is still work to be done. SJSU will be moving forward with searches this year, so that when the new president is selected those searches will be ready to be completed as well.

President Martin looks forward to a great year working with the Senate.

#### **IV. State of the University Announcements. Questions. In rotation.**

##### **A. Vice President of Administration and Finance–**

The Interim VP of Administration and Finance (VPAF), Josee Larochelle, announced that fiscal year 15-16 started off really well with the Governor enacting the state budget on June 24, 2015 before the July 1, 2015 start date and that is always a good thing. One of the most important things is that the state fully funded the CSU support budget. Due to the increased budget, SJSU has been able to fund additional items this year. For the campus, this means increased enrollment growth and capital outlay funds, as well as degree audit funding. Interim VP Larochelle is also working on finalizing the budget book. More information will be available soon.

Interim VP Larochelle reported, “the new capital financing framework for the CSU is a challenge and an opportunity for SJSU and the CSU. In FY 14-15, the Governor transferred responsibility for our infrastructure and capital outlay to the CSU and the campuses. What this means is that we’re responsible for our buildings. As you have seen we have built new student buildings using student fees, such as the new Student Wellness Center, and the Student Union renovation project. However, we have not had a new academic building in a long time. There was a renovation of SPX, but beyond that we have not had an infusion of funds to completely renovate our old academic buildings. Under President Martin’s leadership, we have been able to get a Science replacement building on our five-year capital plan that was presented to the Board of Trustees last week. We have significant planning that has to occur for that.

A Title IX Coordinator has been hired, Diana Epp. An email was sent to the campus today. Also, the staff representative to the Presidential Search Advisory Committee was elected by the staff and she is Hyon Chu-Yi Baker.”

##### **Questions:**

Q: Degree audit funding used to be one-time funding, has that changed?

A: Yes.

Q: When is the Student Union going to be completed?

A: Excellent question. Right now we are planning to open the renovated portion in Spring 2016.

Q: What does it mean to get the Science Building on the five-year capital plan?

A: When a project, such as a Science Replacement Building, is placed on the five-year capital plan and supported by the Board of Trustees, this is the first step for the campus to have a new Science replacement building. Funding for the project is not finalized, nor the actual program plans, which detail academic uses within the building. The CSU budget is adopted on an annual basis and is predicated upon State of California funding. As the CSU finalizes the budget for each year, the amount of CSU funding to support capital projects (like a new Science replacement building for SJSU) will be determined. We are hopeful that CSU funding will be available for the Science replacement building; however, that will not be known for potentially a few years.

Q: How was it determined to put the Science Building as the top priority given the historic placement of a revision or replacement to DMH as the first priority? How did that decision happen? How were the priorities determined?

A: The cabinet discussed major capital needs for the University over the summer, keeping in mind the new capital financing framework discussed earlier. With the change in financing authority, the Cabinet kept in mind large capital projects that would require CSU funding support. The highest priority for the University that came from those discussions was the need for a new Science building. The program planning process, which details the academic uses within the building, has not yet started and will involve the many campus groups. We need to embark on very significant and aggressive program planning of the programs and the space needs that will go into this new building. As for DMH, a DMH renovation and Addition project has been on the five-year capital program for many years. The planning process in the past for a five-year capital program did not include discussions regarding financing for projects. The five-year capital plans were submitted to the Chancellor's Office then to the State for funding and as stated previously, San José State has received very limited funding for our projects. With the change in capital financing and the authority for funding held by the CSU and the campuses, we need to align finances with projects.

[Clarification and updates after the Senate meeting from Interim VP Laroche are included in the questions and answers above and as follows: Facilities Development and Operations (FDO) is working with Academic Affairs on developing options for the University regarding DMH and in particular the heat issue.]

**B. Vice President for Student Affairs –**

VP Blaylock announced that Student Affairs had a very productive summer. There were several orientations for freshman, international, and graduate students. Also, over 3,000 freshmen were moved into the residence halls. President Martin helped students move in as did faculty and staff. Student Affairs also had “Ask Me” tents setup where faculty and students could ask

questions for those new to the campus.

Student Affairs will match the \$250,000 that Associated Students invests in student organizations this year. In addition, Student Affairs will provide over 100 certificates to each college for a student to take a faculty member to coffee at no cost. This will help faculty and students get engaged.

**Questions:**

Q: Do you know if any of our students are affected by the fire in Lake County?

A: We have not heard of any, but the recent fire in the apartment building in downtown San José affected seven of our students and they lost all of their possessions. Prior to the next day, Student Affairs had relocated them to the residence halls and gotten them set up with student aid, and replaced all their books.

**C. Associated Students President –**

Associated Students (AS) had their retreat a few weeks ago and identified three goals for this year. First, AS will focus on restructuring their Senate to allow for student representation from every college. The second goal is to have cohesive advocacy. AS will be focusing on being a team.

The last goal is to improve communication with students and increase their knowledge of what AS does and the services they offer.

The Child Development Center run by AS was recently recognized by First Five California as one of the most prestigious child development centers in Silicon Valley.

AS handed out 15,000 Clipper Cards to students to cover their transportation. In Addition, the AS marketing department gave out over 1,000 Spartan Squad T-Shirts at the football game.

AS is currently searching for a new Director of Intercultural Affairs.

AS is preparing for Homecoming week. The search for a Homecoming King and Queen is very gender inclusive this year and SJSU may end up having a King and King, or Queen and Queen, etc.

Kelsey Brewer, our student trustee, will be visiting the campus and also serving on the Presidential Advisory Search Committee for San José State University.

**D. Vice President for University Advancement –**

VP Lanning announced that he grew up in San José, CA and this is his home. He does not plan on going anywhere soon and hopes to give some stability to

the campus.

The Tower Foundation Board Retreat is coming up on October 12-13, 2015.

The roll-out of a new branding platform has begun with the banners across campus. This is a piece of the refreshing of the image of the university. The most exciting part of this is that the students and faculty worked with University Advancement to develop the image.

Three new development officers have been hired, and searches are underway for two additional development officers.

University Advancement is in the early stages of planning for the next fundraising campaign. One thing VP Lanning wants to be sure University Advancement does is align itself with the strategic planning process, so they will not be rushing ahead with the campaign until the strategic plan is completed.

Two external individuals have been selected to be on the Presidential Search Advisory Committee—Bob Weiss and Ed Oates.

The focus this year in University Advancement is building relationships both external and internal. University Advancement's job is to advance the university's work.

**E. CSU Statewide Senators –**

Senator Van Selst thanked Vice Chair Frazier for stepping in to cover for one of the two CSU Statewide Senators that could not make the last CSU Statewide Senate meeting.

The most recent resolutions passed at the CSU Statewide Senate include a resolution supporting a Senate bill that would ban carrying concealed weapons on campus. There were also two resolutions on high school exit exam requirements. The existing high school exit exam is not aligned with the common core.

A resolution and taskforce is being considered to examine the qualitative reasoning pilot projects at the 7 community college districts that are using the Carnegie Statway sequence to meet CSU GE area B4, but which do not require students to have completed having algebra II as a prerequisite.

A series of baccalaureate degrees are being offered at the community colleges ostensibly as part of a pilot program where the community colleges promised not to overlap substantive degree content with what the CSU and UC are offering, and then proceeded to overlap substantive degree content with what the CSU and UC offer. The CSU brought this to the Community College



Board of Trustees, but they still have not interacted with the CSU since last year and are fully intent on having curriculum on the books for the Fall 2016 semester (i.e., essentially telling us that the horse has left the barn).

Another issue under consideration by Academic Senate: CSU (ASCSU) is background checks for all new employees. The issue is once the background check is done who makes the decision as to whether something that happened say five years ago matters for the position the person is applying for? Many details of implementation are unclear.

The CSU Statewide Senate is considering support for a request for an additional Board of Trustees member who would be an emeriti faculty member, but at the same time the CSU Statewide Senate is also thinking of asking for another regular faculty trustee. It is unlikely the Governor would sign off on legislation for both.

Issues surrounding the budget include the 2% compensation pool which is putting the CSU in a position where we won't be able to compete with our sister schools (CCC, UC). There are also continuing issues surrounding tenure density.

The Chancellor was asked if open presidential searches are permissible, and the Chancellor responded that open searches are permissible if the final three candidates all say yes, otherwise not.

There are also still some concerns about the quality of shared governance across campuses with many campuses experiencing tensions between faculty and administration.

#### **F. Provost –**

SJSU hired 58 tenure/tenure-track faculty this fall, and there are 66 searches underway this academic year. This is unprecedented. SJSU is also in the process of a brand new on board program, "University 101."

There is a lot of information on the Provost website including the priority plans, and information on the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Spaces. About 100 classrooms were upgraded over the summer.

The Provost and VP of Student Affairs are creating a list of all the things that are being done in relation to student success across the campus right now as part of a new Student Success Plan they are working on.

International and Extended Studies (IES) has been tasked with looking at what international student growth looks like on campus, determining what is manageable for the campus, and projecting what we can expect over the next five years.

SJSU has hired a lot of new administrators in Academic Affairs as well.  
Thanks to Lynda Heiden, we started a new on board program for them as well.

There is a new staff professional development program. Academic Affairs is allocating about \$60,000 this Fall, and will do another call for proposals this spring.

**V. Executive Committee Report –**

**A. Executive Committee Minutes –**

**Exec. Minutes of June 22, 2015 – No questions.**

**Exec. Minutes of July 13, 2015 – No questions.**

**Exec. Minutes of July 21, 2015 –**

Q: What is the benefit of having term limits on any position at SJSU, especially the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR)?

A: University Policy F05-2 states, “The term of the office shall be three years and may be renewed once with approval of the President in consultation with the Academic Senate Executive Committee.” There will be a policy recommendation coming from O&G to the October 2015 Senate meeting regarding the FAR. The reason for term limits is to give other people the opportunity to serve in these positions.

**Exec. Minutes of August 10, 2015 – No questions.**

**Exec. Minutes of August 24, 2015 – No questions.**

**B. Consent Calendar –**

AVC Backer presented the consent calendar. **The Senate voted and the consent calendar was approved as amended.**

**C. Executive Committee Action Items: None**

**VI. Unfinished Business - None**

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

**A. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –**

Senator Peter presented *AS 1577, Policy Recommendation, Adjusting the Timing of Performance Reviews During the Transition to the New System for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP), Amends S15-7 (RTP Procedures) (Final Reading)*.

Senator Peter presented an amendment that was friendly to change line 67 to read, “The second sentence” instead of “The final sentence.” A motion was made and seconded to approve the resolution. **The Senate voted and AS 1577 was approved as amended (47-0-0).**

Senator Peter presented *AS 1576, Policy Recommendation, Further Clarification of the Transition to the New System for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP), Amends S15-8 (RTP Criteria and Standards) (Final Reading)*. A motion was made and seconded to approve the resolution. **The Senate voted and AS 1576 was**

**approved (46-0-1).**

**B. Organization and Government Committee (O&G) –**

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1575, Senate Management Resolution, Modification of Undergraduate Studies Committee Charge (Final Reading)*. A motion was made and seconded to approve the resolution. **The Senate voted and AS 1575 was approved (46-0-1).**

---

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1573, Senate Management Resolution, Modification of the Academic Disqualification and Reinstatement Review Committee Membership and Charge (Final Reading)*.

Senator Frazier presented several friendly amendments. Line 11 was changed to read, “Rescinds SM-F09-2” instead of “Modifies SM-F09-2,” and then line 19 was changed to read, “That SM-F09-2 be rescinded and replaced with the following with regard to membership, titles, and charge:” Senator Frazier presented another amendment that was friendly to line 15 that changed it to read, “...reinstatement petitions, as partially set forth in S10-6, Academic Standards, Probation, and Disqualification policy, or its amendments or revisions, and.” A motion was made and seconded to return the resolution to the O&G Committee to review and incorporate these amendments, and to also review S10-6 and consider bringing one resolution back to the Senate that replaces both SM-F09-2 and S10-6. The Senate voted and the motion to return to committee with instructions was approved (47-0-0).

---

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1574, Senate Management Resolution, Dissolving the University Teacher Education Committee (Final Reading)*. Senator Backer presented an amendment that was friendly to add a second Resolved to read, “Resolved: That SM-S12-1 be rescinded.” Senator Buzanski presented an amendment that was friendly to change line 26 to remove “in time.” Senator Sabalius presented an amendment that was friendly to change line 37 to read, “Workload Impact: Slight reduction.” A motion was made and seconded to approve the resolution as amended. **The Senate voted and AS 1574 was approved as amended (47-0-0).**

**C. University Library Board (ULB) – None**

**D. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) –**

Senator Mathur presented *AS 1580, Policy Recommendation, Credit by Exam (First Reading)*. The Senate approved the Credit by Exam policy at the last Spring 2015 Senate meeting, however, after the policy was passed several issues arose where the policy was not fully in compliance with CSU policy and Title V. Therefore, the resolution was referred back to C&R for additional revision. Changes to this

resolution include the complete removal of the waiver programs, and challenge exams will be run through the testing office.

**Questions:**

Q: Could you explain the procedure of how the exam goes from the instructor to the testing office, etc.

A: Over the summer, C&R met all the pertinent players including AVP Anagnos, Marian Sofish, etc. The old way was that students had to register for the course and then the department chair submitted the paperwork to the Registrar. The new way is that the student approaches the testing office, or the department, and tells them he/she is interested in challenging a course. The testing office would then contact the department chair and see if they are willing to do the challenge exam. Then all the paperwork will be handled by the testing office.

Q: Is the testing office grading the Exam?

A: No, it goes to the department.

Q: Does this policy prohibit departments from not allowing a course to be challenged?

A: No, it is up to the department whether a course can be challenged.

Q: In line 78, it calls for “28” days, is there something special about “28” days?

A: This is so that mathematically it does not fall on a weekend day.

Q: I just want reassurance that the department will have the final say in whether a course is challengeable or not?

A: The department has the final word in whether a course is challengeable or not.

Q: What about cross-listed courses, who decides? For example, the American Institutions requirement is met by about six different departments.

A: C&R did not discuss this, but we will discuss this at the next meeting.

Q: What did the policy originally say about waiver exams, and why did it have to be removed?

A: It was US1, US2, and US3. C&R eliminated it because Title V allows individual campuses to have waiver exams. Waiver exams are not for credit per se, it is a requirement that is met. In addition, the California institutions requirement has no alternative exam anywhere.

Q: What prevents every student from taking the class to see if they can’t pass it first?

A: They don’t have to pay for the full payment of a course, but they will have to pay for taking the exam.

Q: This is probably a lot cheaper than taking the course, so again what prevents every student from taking it?

A: The fee is very steep. Students will not want to waste several hundred dollars, and students can only take the challenge exam for a specific course one time.

Q: I believe some of the concern is that the faculty will be spending the time correcting the exam, but there is no return of funds to the department.

A: This is the way it is currently set up but we will be submitting a Course Fee Advisory Committee proposal, so that some of the funds would be coming back to the faculty member. There was quite a bit of discussion about this in C&R.

#### **E. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) –**

Senator Kaufman presented *AS 1581, Policy Recommendation, Instructor Drops in Online Courses (First Reading)*.

This is an amendment to the existing policy on drops from classes. The existing policy, S05-12, talks about the procedures for a faculty member to drop a student from a class for not showing up, but does not give any procedures for dropping a student from an online class. This amendment will add wording that talks about ways you can establish a student is attending an online class. There are three ways listed here a student can prove attendance including completing a class assignment, informing the instructor of their intent to continue in the class, or having logged three or more hours of time on the learning management system.

#### **Questions:**

Q: Could not completing a co or prerequisite be a reason for dropping a student?

A: I believe not having satisfied co or prerequisites is already a reason you can drop a student from a class, but it may not be in the specific wording of this policy. I&SA will look into this.

Q: Is the three hours of learning management system time activity or just logged on time?

A: The policy says “of logged time.” However, it also says with “verifiable activity.”

Q: What is the timeline for the online classes, is it an assignment done within a week? There are no timelines given.

A: This is part of the difficulty, we do not have a good definition of an online class. I suppose we could include completing the first assignment in whatever timeframe is proposed by the instructor.

A: For the College of Engineering students, we have to submit our unofficial transcripts to the professors and if you do not meet the prerequisites, they drop you immediately.

Q: In my experience as a chair, the faculty members often complain that the student comes to the first couple of classes and then doesn't come back and refuses to allow them to drop him/her from the class. Would the committee consider bringing some parity between online and in-person classes and giving more standards to in-person classes for the right to drop students.

A: I&SA will look into it.

#### **VIII. Special Committee Reports –**

Dr. Camille Johnson gave an update on WASC.

Last August 20<sup>th</sup>, the WASC Steering Committee submitted SJSU's report. On October 21<sup>st</sup>, WASC asked for additional documents to be submitted to them. The WASC Steering Committee then had an offsite review. This basically meant five or six of the WASC Steering Committee members in a room and the WASC auditors in their room and a discussion via the computer screen. The WASC team spent about ½ hour telling the WASC Steering Committee what else they wanted to know.

Sixteen WASC team members came to the campus from all over California. They were here for three days. They had 25 meeting sessions in those three days and met with over 90 people from the campus. They met with faculty, staff, and students in separate groups. There were 42 lines of inquiry SJSU had to address. SJSU then got seven years of accreditation.

SJSU did receive some commendations. WASC appreciated our mid-level staff leadership. WASC recognized our budget situation and issues. They also recognized that we had started early work on our five core competencies. SJSU was also the first cohort to be accredited under this new system. In fact, in 2013 the WASC handbook came out and we were accredited in 2014.

WASC will be coming back in Spring 2017. SJSU will have a mid-cycle review in Spring 2019. Then an offsite interview in 2021. Then the WASC accreditation visit will happen in Spring 2022.

WASC pointed out two problem areas and they include; our leadership issues and our campus climate. Each of these elements will be in our special report.

SJSU had to submit lots of data to WASC on GE and our progress in core competencies. The WASC Steering Committee laid out a schedule for our core competencies.

WASC provided us with the Commission Action Letter which is four pages long, and the Team Report which is 50 pages long. There are about 30 areas for us to address and about 39 criteria to review. SJSU needs to create a living document that lists areas we need to address and the progress we've made each year and keep a table of who is working on what.

There is a WASC Steering Committee meeting on October 16, 2015. WASC wanted Student Affairs to be more involved in assessment, so SJSU will be sending some of the Student Affairs staff to assessment training as we go through the process.

Another area SJSU needs to work on is increasing the presence of University Learning Goals (ULGs). These were passed over two years ago by the Senate. The ULGs have been posted on the SJSU website. However, they need to be pushed out to the campus to make them come to life. In the College of Education, Sami Monsur got the Dean to pay for post-its with the ULGs on them and they plastered the walls of Sweeney Hall with them.

The WASC Steering Committee is also working to get Deans and Chairs training on how to write their WASC reports before they have to do them in the next few years. WASC also wants the core competencies assessed near graduation.

SJSU managed to increase the response rate to the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) by 10%. This gave SJSU access to reports by college, department, and program. You can see how much writing the students are doing in your department, etc.

Student Success and Campus Climate are areas we continue working on. SJSU has to show the effect on students rather than the number of students that showed up. SJSU also has to show WASC that our action plans are being accomplished.

There are so many great things happening on campus, but we are not coordinating our efforts. The WASC Steering Committee hopes a living document will allow SJSU to track who is working on what so our efforts can be coordinated.

Over the next few years SJSU needs to support and develop the core competencies in GE and assessment. WASC would like us to assess all five core competencies close to graduation.

The Senate also needs to revisit the WASC Steering Committee composition and charge going forward, and also develop and promote University Learning Goals (ULGs).

**Questions:**

Q: How common is it for WASC to issue another visit in two years?

A: It is not that uncommon, but may be due to our circumstances e.g. governance issues last year.

Q: What is the Senate's role in addressing shared governance issues brought by WASC?

A: The hiring of the new President and the working relationship will be watched closely by WASC.

**IX. New Business –**

**Election of two Faculty to the Presidential Selection Advisory Committee**

Statements were presented by Senator Pat Backer, Dr. Noelle Brada-Williams, Senator Craig Clements, Senator Lynda Heiden, and Dr. Camille Johnson. **The Senate voted by secret ballot and Senator Heiden and Dr. Camille Johnson were elected.**

**X. Adjournment –** The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Consent Calendar 2015-2016				
October 5, 2015				
<b>Policy Committees</b>				
<b>COMMITTEE</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>UNIT</b>	<b>TERM</b>	<b>NOTES</b>
Organization & Government	Bernd Becker	General Unit	2016	
<b>Operating Committees</b>				
<b>COMMITTEE</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>UNIT</b>	<b>TERM</b>	
Institutional Review Board—Human Subjects	Mark Van Selst	At Large Seat (Humanities & the Arts)	2016	
Institutional Review Board—Human Subjects	Jim Duza	Physician or licensed health professional	2016	
International Programs and Students Committee	Tricia Ryan Foust	AVP for Enrollment and Academic Services or designee	EXO	
Program Planning	Clifton Oyamoto	Business	2016	
Program Planning	Colleen Haight	Education	2016	
Program Planning	Kathy Lemon	Applied Sciences & Arts	2018	
<b>Other Committees</b>				
<b>COMMITTEE</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>UNIT</b>	<b>TERM</b>	
Heritage, Preservation, and Public History Committee	Dore Bowen	Humanities & the Arts	2018	
University Library Board	Nyle Monday	At Large Seat (Social Sciences)	2016	
<b>Remove:</b>				
<b>COMMITTEE</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>UNIT</b>	<b>TERM</b>	
Academic Senate Seat	Kell Fujimoto	General Unit		Resigned
Organization & Government	Kell Fujimoto	General Unit	2016	
Institutional Review Board—Human Subjects	Barbara Fu	Physician or licensed health professional	2016	
International Programs and Students Committee	Diana McDonald	AVP for Enrollment and Academic Services or designee	EXO	
Program Planning	Collette LaSalle	Applied Sciences & Arts	2018	
Program Planning	Tanvi Kothari	Business	2018	
Heritage, Preservation, and Public History Committee	Jean Beard	Science	TBD	
Heritage, Preservation, and Public History Committee	Robert Dias	AVP of Facilities, Development and Operations or designee	EXO	
Heritage, Preservation, and Public History Committee	Elba Maldonado-Colon	Education	TBD	
Heritage, Preservation, and Public History Committee	Ann Fountain	Humanities & the Arts	TBD	



**Executive Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**ADM 167, Noon to 1:30 p.m.**  
**August 31, 2015**

Present: Kimbarow, Peter, Martin, Frazier, Lanning, Shifflett, Heiden, Feinstein, Kaufman, Backer, Larochelle, Blaylock, Amante (12:04 p.m.), Mathur

Absent: Lee

1. Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of August 24, 2015. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes. The committee voted and the minutes were approved (13-0-0).
2. A motion was made and seconded to approve the consent calendar dated August 31, 2015. The committee voted and the consent calendar was approved (14-0-0).
3. Vacant committee seats go at-large after the third week of school effective September 10<sup>th</sup>.
4. The committee clarified its position regarding participation in committee meetings via teleconference. Concerns regarding members not physically present include: possible objection to voting remotely or by email, confidentiality, reliability of teleconferencing technology and the additional burden on the chair to ensure teleconferencing is setup and maintained during the meeting. It was noted that the Executive Committee does not permit members to participate in meetings remotely and that Senate nominating petitions specify that all Senators must be available for meetings.

A referral was made to the Organization and Government Committee to review and possibly amend the bylaws and standing rules regarding this issue. In the meantime, a motion was made and seconded that teleconferencing or web-conferencing will not be permitted in lieu of attendance at that meeting. The committee voted and the motion passed (13-1-0).

5. The Provost requested that the Academic Senate begin the process to setup search committees for the Vice President of Administration and Finance, and the Chief Diversity Officer. [Post-meeting further discussion between the Executive Committee and the President's Office confirmed that the CDO search was extended from last year and as such the search committee will continue as previously appointed. Should any vacancies arise the positions will be filled per standard Senate appointment procedures.
6. Policy Committee Updates:
  - a. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):  
O&G will be bringing several policies to the Senate at the September 14, 2015 meeting including Strategic Planning, the Budget Advisory Committee, and changing the charge of the Undergraduate Studies Committee. O&G is also

working on revisions to the FAR policy, and a policy recommendation related to a Retention and Graduation Equity Steering Committee.

- b. Professional Standards Committee (PS):  
PS is working on the implementation of the Retention-Tenure-Promotion (RTP) policies. The appointments policy is already in effect, and the other two policies will be implemented AY 2016-2017. PS is working with Faculty Affairs to establish a workshop on September 28, 2015 directed at departments that need to redo their guidelines.

PS is also working with Faculty Affairs on selecting a platform for Electronic Dossiers. They are looking at four platforms and will narrow that down to two platforms, then allow the campus to select. Electronic Dossiers will be rolled out next year. Dossier guidelines will go out later this year.

PS will be bringing a small amendment to the RTP Procedures policy to the September 14, 2015 Senate meeting.

PS is looking into a possible Canvas course on the RTP Criteria and Standards.

PS is currently discussing SOTES/SOLATES.

- c. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):  
I&SA will be bringing several resolutions to the September 14, 2015 Senate meeting including a revision to the Final Exams policy that specifies when makeup exams can be given, and a change to the Drop policy that specifies when students will be dropped from online classes.

I&SA has several referrals they are working on including modifying the Greensheet and Honors policies.

- d. The Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):  
C&R is working on a referral to review and modify the Program Planning Guidelines, review and modify the minor policy, and will be bringing the Credit by Exam policy the Senate passed at the end of Spring back with modifications requested by the Provost and President.

The committee discussed the possibility of transferring the approval of Physical Education waivers from the C&R Committee to the Graduate and Undergraduate Programs (GUP) Office.

- 7. The committee received an update on the Faculty Representatives to the Presidential Advisory Committee selection process. Chair Kimbarow met with the Deans on July 23, 2015. The Deans were given a one-page summary of the procedures and the timeline. Two colleges (CASA and EDUC), and the General Unit did not have any nominees come forward. The colleges of BUS, SCI, and ENGR had only one nominee and will not need to conduct elections for their candidates. H&A and COSS are in the process of

conducting elections with the help of the Senate Office. Election results are due to the Senate Office by close of business on September 11, 2015. The Senate will then vote and elect two from the five faculty representatives at the September 14, 2015 Senate meeting.

8. The committee discussed reports that are due to the Senate and Executive Committee during the academic year and how to fit those reports into the Senate schedule given the number of resolutions that are coming before the Senate this year. Several options were discussed including the possibility of adding additional Senate meetings to the Fall and Spring specifically for reports. The committee will discuss this further at the next Executive Committee meeting.

Dr. Camille Johnson will give a WASC update at the September 14, 2015 Senate meeting. At the October 5, 2015 Senate meeting, Interim VP Laroche will give the University Budget Report and Provost Feinstein and Marne Genes will give the Academic Affairs Budget Presentation.

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

These minutes were taken and transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on August 31, 2015. They were edited by Chair Kimbarow on September 2, 2015. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on September 21, 2015.

**Executive Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**ADM 167, Noon to 1:30 p.m.**  
**September 21, 2015**

Present: Kimbarow, Peter, Martin, Frazier, Lanning, Shifflett, Heiden, Feinstein, Kaufman, Larochelle, Blaylock, Amante, Mathur, Lee

Absent: Backer

1. Approval of Executive Committee Minutes of August 31, 2015. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes. The committee voted and the minutes were approved (13-0-1).
2. Feedback and suggestions on the Senate meeting of September 14, 2015. The committee discussed giving mandatory reports a time certain for presentation and limiting the amount of time allotted for the report so there is more time for questions. Another suggestion was to determine which reports could be given in writing to the Senate, and did not need to be made in person. Chair Kimbarow will set up a subgroup of committee members to review the list of mandatory reports and decide which should be presented in person.
3. Chair Kimbarow will ask AVP Green to provide a brief presentation to the Senate on the Teaching Associate Fee Waiver Program. This program is supposed to be reviewed by the Senate every five years according to University Policy S05-9, but it does not appear to have been reviewed in the past.
4. The committee discussed the procedure for the selection of faculty on committees that do not belong to the Senate, such as the Spartan Shops Board. Appointments to these committees are not governed by Senate bylaws or procedures, but by the Auxillary's policies and procedures. Chair Kimbarow will meet with Interim President Martin to discuss how she would like the Executive Committee to solicit and nominate faculty for these appointments.
5. Dean Chin is proposing a merger of the Elementary and Secondary Education Departments. The Secondary Education Department has been unable to identify a suitable chair internally or through external searches.
6. A motion was made and seconded to approve the appointment of Francis Howard to the Exceptional Assigned Time Committee as the General Unit representative. The committee voted and the motion carried (7-0-0).
7. A motion was made and seconded to approve the appointment of Diane Guerrazzi on the Academic Council on International Programs (ACIP) as San José State University's representative. The committee voted and the motion carried (7-0-0).
8. The committee discussed the nominees for the VP for Administration and Finance Search Committee. The committee voted and recommendations were made to Interim President Martin.

9. Policy Committee Updates:

- a. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):  
O&G will be bringing several policies to the Senate at the October 5, 2015 meeting including revisions to the Strategic Planning Policy, creation of a Budget Advisory Committee, revisions to the FAR policy, changes to the Board of General Studies (BOGS) membership and charge, and changes to the Writing Requirements Committee.
- b. The Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):  
C&R is working on several referrals including a review of and modification to the Program Planning Guidelines, a review and modification to the minor policy, Internship and Service Learning, and the Credit by Exam policy.
- c. Professional Standards Committee (PS):  
PS had two amendments to the RTP policies signed by Interim President Martin this week. PS is hosting a workshop with Faculty Affairs on September 28, 2015, for departments that need to redo their guidelines. PS and Faculty Affairs will continue to host a series of workshops throughout the year. PS and Faculty Affairs are still testing platforms for online Dossiers. Those faculty members that choose to be evaluated under the old system may have to continue with the paper Dossier.
- d. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):  
I&SA is currently reviewing the drop policy for online classes, and the Final Exams policy.

I&SA has several referrals they are working on including the Greensheet Policy, Mandatory Advising, and Academic Disqualification.

10. Updates from the Administration:

- a. From the President:  
SJSU now has a total of 32,775 students. Freshmen admissions are up 20%, and Graduate Admissions are up 10%. The student makeup is 51% male and 49% female. SJSU should finish the year at 103.5% of our target enrollment.
- b. From the Provost:  
A Department of Education Press Release today announced the award of a \$3 million grant to SJSU for supporting the STEM Program.
- c. From the VP of Student Affairs:  
VP Blaylock contacted the four students identified as living in Lake County where massive fires are still being fought. He was able to reach two of the four students and the fire had come very close to their homes, but fortunately they were spared. The students were very appreciative that the university called to

check on them. However, VP Blaylock was unable to reach the other two students and that is of concern. He will continue trying to reach them.

d. From the VP of University Advancement:

A team from the university will be meeting at city hall to go over SJSU's plans for the South Campus Golf Complex. This was funded solely by donations and should open in December 2016. A suggestion was made to publicize the fact that SJSU needs donations for more than just athletic buildings. Many of our academic buildings are falling apart.

e. From the Associated Students President (AS):

The Peace Pole is waiting to be installed in front of the Rose Garden. It has twelve languages on it.

AS will hold their first town hall meeting in three years on October 14, 2015. Student Trustee Kelsey Brewer will be at SJSU for the meeting.

AS will be selecting their new Director of Internal Affairs this coming Wednesday, September 23, 2015.

11. The meeting adjourned at 1:36 p.m.

These minutes were taken and transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on September 21, 2015. They were edited by Chair Kimbarow on September 22, 2015. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on September 28, 2015.



# SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY

Academic Senate Office  
ADM 176, 0024

## GENERAL ELECTIONS 2016 Calendar

Timeline	Election Events
Friday, February 5	Cover letter with instructions and petitions sent to all faculty. Petitions on line/attached.
Monday, February 22	Nominating petitions due in Senate Office (ADM 176).
Tuesday - Monday February 23 – February 29	Verification of petitions and preparation of online ballots.
Wednesday, March 2	Ballots online and info sent to college deans' offices electronically.
Friday, March 18	Online voting/ballots due by 5 p.m. to College Committee on Committees Representatives and AVC.
Monday – Wednesday March 21 – March 23	CC Representative verifies appointment times for faculty that voted with College Deans' Offices.
Thursday – March 24	Final ballot count by the Election Committee.
Monday, April 4	Results reported to Academic Senate with percent of voters.

Approved: September 25, 2015  
Committee on Committees

Approved: September 28, 2015  
Executive Committee

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_  
Academic Senate

San José State University  
Academic Senate  
Organization and Government Committee  
October 5, 2015  
Final Reading

AS 1551

Policy Recommendation  
Modification of Writing Requirements Committee Membership

Legislative History: Rescinds S03-2 which amended S95-5. S03-2 had amended sections E1 and E2 of S95-5 which specified the composition and selection process for the Writing Requirements Committee.

- Whereas: SJSU's commitment to writing has resulted in a significant number of faculty hires and changes in areas of responsibility for writing programs; and
- Whereas: The Writing Programs Administrator (WPA) plays a significant role in establishing a strong frosh composition program at SJSU yet is not currently a voting member of the Writing Requirements Committee (WRC); and
- Whereas: The Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) Director also plays a significant role in supporting and coordinating SJSU's writing across the curriculum program, particularly as it is expressed through 100W and other university-wide writing programs yet is not currently a voting member of the WRC; and
- Whereas: Some administrative offices and positions have changed title since the original committee composition was written; and
- Whereas: The WRC has rarely, if ever, been able to fill both student positions on the committee, a difficulty that has been made more complex by the requirement that one student must have learned a language other than English as his or her first language; and
- Whereas: In the spirit of our commitment to improving writing and the transfer experience for all students, the WRC has created the possibility for ongoing meaningful dialogue and communication with community college partners through the establishment of a semi-annual community college partners luncheon focused on writing; therefore be it
- Resolved: That University Policy S03-2, be rescinded and replaced with the revisions detailed below to amend Sections E1 and E2 of S95-5.

Rationale: The WPA and WAC are faculty fully engaged in issues related to student writing. The WPA was hired in 2014 to run frosh composition and the WAC Director was to support and coordinate writing across the curriculum, particularly 100W.

The title changes proposed reflect the consolidation of undergraduate and graduate studies and the change in title to Student Academic Success Services. The current charge states "campus writing coordinator and/or Writing Skills Coordinator..." We have no designated "campus writing coordinator" (the WAC Director effectively fills that role) so that terminology has been deleted.



Current composition calls for two students, one of which “shall” have a language other than English as first language. However, given the difficulty in getting students to serve, this proposal allows for greater flexibility so as to encourage student participation on the committee with a preference for one position to go to a student whose first language was not English. Similarly, inserting “undergraduate or graduate” encourages both types of students to be on the committee.

Currently, S03-2 calls for a representative from each of the community colleges in our service area. In lieu of having people serve on the committee, which has been impossible to accomplish given workloads and schedules, we have created a standing, semi-annual meeting to which community college deans and their writing chairs and/or coordinators are invited. As such, we no longer need to have the non-voting representatives from each community college, a system that has never worked and has not had representation.

Finally, changing the process for selection of college faculty representatives allows for greater transparency with regard to the opportunity to serve on the WRC

Approved: 9/28/15

Vote: 8-0-0

Present: Grosvenor, Mathur, Curry, Gleixner, Shifflett, Elmiarri, Becker, Beyersdorf

Absent: Laker

Financial Impact: None expected

Workload Impact: No change from current situation.

E.1 The University Writing Requirements Committee (WRC) shall be an administrative committee reporting to the Board of General Studies. The committee shall be composed of the following:

- College Dean (EXO; WRC Chair; Appointed by the Provost)

- SJSU Writing Programs Administrator (WPA) (EXO)

- SJSU Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) Director (EXO)

- AVP, Graduate & Undergraduate Programs or Designee (EXO)

- Director of Testing (EXO; non voting)

- SJSU Writing Skills Coordinator (EXO; non voting)

- AVP Student Academic Success Services or Designee (EXO; non voting)

- 1 faculty member from the University Library

- 1 Faculty, Applied Sciences & Arts

- 1 Faculty, Business

- 1 Faculty, Education

- 1 Faculty, Engineering

- 2 Faculty, Humanities & the Arts with one from the Department of Linguistics and Language Development

- 1 Faculty, Science

- 1 Faculty, Social Sciences

2 students (undergraduate or graduate) who have satisfied the Written Communication II requirement, one of which shall, preferably, have experience with ESL learning.

## E. 2 Recruitment and Appointment of Members

Faculty members will serve a 3-year term with the possibility of renewable for one additional 3-year term if selected. Student members will serve a renewable 1-year term. Recruitment to serve on the Writing Requirements Committee will be done through the normal Committee on Committees process for the seats designated for faculty members and students. When there are multiple applications for a seat the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate will select individuals to serve. In considering potential WRC members, attention should focus on the person's experience and engagement in activities related to student writing.

### E.2.a Interim Appointments.

When a seat will be vacant for no more than 1 semester (e.g., sabbatical) 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.

### E.2.b Replacing Members

If a member is absent from three regularly scheduled committee meetings in an academic year, the chair of the WRC may request that the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate initiate action to recruit a replacement. If a member repeatedly does not perform assigned committee duties, the chair of the WRC may request that the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate initiate action to recruit a replacement.

San Jose State University  
Academic Senate  
Organization and Government Committee  
October 5, 2015  
First Reading

AS 1578

Policy Recommendation  
Revision to SJSU Strategic Planning Policy

Legislative History: Rescinds S09-6 (our current strategic planning policy) and SM-S12-2 which expanded the membership of the Strategic Planning Board; Amends Senate Bylaw 10.1 which provides a listing of special agencies.

Whereas: Strategic planning is a collaborative process that enables us to create a shared university vision, and

Whereas: The recently endorsed statement (May 2015) on shared governance points out that ‘Whether formulating policy, issuing directives, or making decisions of less formal character, both the Senate and the Administration should consult widely with those affected by decisions’, and

Whereas: An update to existing policy on strategic planning at this time is needed to bring closure to the Vision 2017 strategic planning process and initiate the next cycle of strategic planning, therefore be it

Resolved: That S09-6 and SM-S12-2 be replaced by this policy, and be it further

Resolved: That senate bylaw 10.1 be amended to delete item E (strategic planning assessment agency), and be it further

Resolved: That the attached policy be adopted and a strategic planning steering committee be constituted by Fall 2016.

Rationale: Utilizing information from those involved in the last strategic planning cycle as well as those new to campus, this is an ideal time to revise the strategic planning policy in ways that bring closure to vision 2017, nurture collaboration across and within divisions, and act on the recommendations from the WASC visiting team with respect to engaging the campus community around strategic planning.

The specific amendment to bylaw 10.1 is needed since this policy recommendation provides for a strategic planning steering committee with responsibilities that include the evaluation functions of the former strategic planning assessment agency and are aligned with work related to the formation and implementation of a strategic plan for the University.

A range of perspectives exist regarding past challenges related to SJSU’s strategic planning policy and its implementation (e.g., change in leadership, unwieldy committee size, lack of clarity regarding the process and/or committee responsibilities). This policy recommendation seeks to provide a structure and guidelines that clarify roles and responsibilities, improves communication and campus engagement throughout the life cycle of strategic planning, and results in a process that is transparent, inclusive and leads to the outcomes identified in the strategic plan.

Approved: 9/28/15

Vote: 8-0-0

Present: Grosvenor, Mathur, Curry, Gleixner, Shifflett, Elmiaari, Beyersdorf, Becker

Absent: Laker

**Financial Impact:** Costs associated with the facilitation of meetings and materials related to a variety of communication strategies are expected.

**Workload Impact:** An increase is expected for a strategic planning support staff person and individuals and groups tasked with (a) the planning and implementation of meetings and events, (b) leadership responsibilities in the planning and implementation of initiatives associated with the strategic plan, and (c) evaluation and reporting responsibilities related to the strategic planning process and its outcomes.

## **1. Strategic Planning Steering Committee**

The Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC) will be a special agency of the Academic Senate. The SPSC will be advisory to the President and serve as a resource to solicit the views of the SJSU community as they pertain to the university's strategic direction. This steering committee is also intended as a resource to the campus community to facilitate the healthy development, implementation and evaluation of the strategic plan throughout its life cycle. The strategic planning steering committee plays an important role in nurturing shared governance in ways that provide for an inclusive process that leads to the achievement of common goals.

### **1.1 Charge**

Responsible for advising the President on all aspects of the development, implementation, evaluation, and revision of a strategic plan for SJSU. Ongoing review of the process along with communication and engagement with campus constituents will be central to the steering committee's responsibilities as well as the plan's legitimacy and efficacy.

### **1.2 Membership**

Academic Senate Chair (SPSC co-chair) (EXO)  
Provost or Designee (SPSC co-chair) (EXO)  
VP Student Affairs or Designee (EXO)  
VP Administration & Finance/CFO or Designee (EXO)  
VP Advancement or Designee (EXO)  
Chief Diversity Officer or Designee (EXO)  
Athletics Director or Designee (EXO)  
AS President (EXO)  
1 Dean  
1 Department Chair  
1 Faculty-at-large

1 Graduate Student  
1 Staff  
1 SJSU Alumni Board Member  
1 Tower Foundation Board Member

Support Staff (not members):

- President's Chief of Staff: to provide logistical and administrative support for the SPSC.
- Director Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics: to provide support to the committee as needed with respect to data gathering and/or reporting.

### **1.2.1 Recruitment and Appointment of Members**

Each member will initially serve a 3-year term renewable for one additional 3-year term. Recruitment of applicants to serve on the SPSC will be done through the normal Committee on Committees process for the seats designated for a dean, chair, faculty member, staff member and student. Recommendations for an alum member will be solicited from the SJSU Alumni Board. Recommendations for a community member will be solicited from the SJSU Tower Board. When filling initial appointments, the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate will stagger the terms to insure continuity over time for a majority of the committee. When there are multiple applications for a seat the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate will select individuals to serve. In considering potential SPSC members attention should focus on the person's skills and experience in these areas: strategic planning, assessment, engagement of individuals and groups.

### **1.2.2 Interim Appointments.**

When a seat will be vacant for no more than 1 semester (e.g., sabbatical) 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.

### **1.2.3 Replacing Members**

If a member is absent from three regularly scheduled committee meetings, the chairs of the SPSC may request that the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate initiate action to recruit a replacement. If a member repeatedly does not perform assigned committee duties, the chairs of the SPSC may request that the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate initiate action to recruit a replacement.

## **1.3 Responsibilities of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee**

The co-chairs of the strategic planning steering committee will schedule and preside at meetings, prepare agendas, propose and maintain time-lines for its activities, assign responsibilities to members as needed, and take responsibility for the effective operation of the SPSC.

1.3.1 Plan, initiate and take part in conversations about strategic planning goals and priorities for the University with the campus, groups and individuals having a leadership role on campus (e.g., Academic Senate, Deans, Chairs, President, President's Cabinet, Students), and external communities. Representatives are tasked with facilitating an inclusive dialogue among the entire SJSU community. While this clearly involves listening to groups and individuals actively engaged in leadership roles on campus, the strategic planning steering committee should especially seek input from those who are not often consulted or involved in such processes. The task of engaging diverse voices in an ongoing manner is critical for establishing and implementing effective planning and evaluation processes.

1.3.2 Consider all university resources in preparation of a strategic plan including, but not limited to: budget, space, human capital, technology, and other university assets.

1.3.3 Circulate a draft of the overall strategic plan and priorities to obtain input from the campus.

1.3.4 Prepare, for the President's consideration, a strategic plan for SJSU which includes recommendations for a limited set of goals, strategies for achieving those goals, and performance measures to assess outcomes related to each goal. The strategic plan will typically span a 5-7 year time frame.

1.3.5 Following consultation with the Budget Advisory Committee, advise the President regarding the alignment of campus resources with the strategic plan.

1.3.6 Provide suggestions with respect to communication plans related to strategic planning.

1.3.6.1 Individual SPSC members will communicate and promote the approved strategic plan and implementation strategies among the groups they represent.

1.3.7 Annually, collect a report detailing activities and accomplishments from the individuals assigned to lead initiatives related to one of the strategic planning goals.

1.3.8 Annually document and evaluate actions and outcomes of the strategic plan. Data from multiple sources and perspectives should be examined whenever possible. Evaluations should be made with respect to progress and effectiveness of implementation in the context of appropriate performance measures, timelines, and allocated resources. Included should be an evaluation of the strategic planning process overall and suggestions for any modifications that might be called for.

1.3.9 As identified in the strategic planning process (section 2) prepare reports as needed. In addition, the Academic Senate chair annually completes the summary report required of all special agencies and communicates that report to the Senate.

## **2. Strategic Planning Process**

### **2.1 Review the University Mission with the President**

The SPSC will meet with the president to discuss strategic planning in the context of SJSU's mission and obtain information and guidance on his/her priorities and vision for the campus.

### **2.2 Internal & External Analyses Conducted by the SPSC**

The SPSC will examine SJSU's internal and external environment in a variety of ways to facilitate subsequent recommendations with respect to the strategic plan. The information evaluated should include recommendations from the most recent WASC review, campus-wide data, and outcomes of the last strategic planning cycle.

### **2.4 Develop Goals and Draft Strategic Plan**

The SPSC will plan and implement dialogues to guide the development of goals to be included in the strategic plan. Dialogs should be conducted in a thorough, collaborative, and inclusive manner.

The SPSC will circulate widely a draft of the overall strategic plan to obtain further input from the campus.

The SPSC will seek the endorsement of the Academic Senate for their recommended strategic plan.

The SPSC will prepare and present to the President for his/her consideration a final draft strategic plan. Recommendations should include a limited set of goals, strategies for addressing goals, and metrics to evaluate performance.

The President is responsible for finalizing the strategic plan.

### **2.5 Communicate the Strategic Plan to Campus**

The President will take the lead on communicating the strategic plan and its progress. Communication will be reinforced by the President's Cabinet, the Academic Senate, the SPSC, and those serving as the lead for each goal in the strategic plan. The President's area of the SJSU web site should maintain an updated record of the plan, its progress, and a mechanism to collect feedback throughout the strategic planning cycle.

### **2.6 Implementation of Strategic Plan**

The President assigns responsibility for the implementation of each goal. One individual will be designated as the lead for each goal. That person will organize implementation efforts (e.g., establish task forces or working groups) as needed.

Each person taking the lead for a goal will be responsible for planning and implementing strategies, monitoring progress, and collecting performance measures related to their goal. Each lead can form working groups and engage the help of other units and individuals as needed. Each spring, leads will prepare a report for the strategic planning steering committee regarding activities and accomplishments for the previous year.

## **2.7 Monitoring the Strategic Plan**

The SPSC will regularly review the University's progress on established goals and the strategic planning process overall.

The SPSC will obtain information from the budget advisory committee so that advice can be conveyed to the President regarding the alignment of campus resources to the strategic plan.

Each year, the SPSC will prepare, in consultation with the president, a summary report that will be widely distributed.

In the final year of a strategic planning cycle, a summary report for the President from the SPSC will focus on the University's cumulative achievements as well as an evaluation of the process.

## **2.8 Communicate outcomes at the conclusion of the strategic planning cycle to campus.**

In alignment with an overall communications strategy that keeps the SJSU community informed throughout the process and reflects input provided by the SPSC, the President's Cabinet, and the Academic Senate, outcomes of a completed strategic planning cycle will be conveyed to campus by the President.

## **3. Policy Modifications**

Following implementation, if modifications to this policy appear needed the strategic planning steering committee will provide the Academic Senate Chair with its suggestions. The chair of the Academic Senate will then refer the recommendations out to the appropriate policy committee for timely review and subsequent action.



San Jose State University  
Academic Senate  
Organization and Government Committee  
October 5, 2015  
First Reading

AS 1579

Policy Recommendation  
Budget Advisory Committee

Legislative History: Rescinds SM-S03-1 (which placed the Budget Advisory Committee in rotation with policy committees on the Senate agenda); Modifies S09-6 (to remove content related to a budget advisory committee from our current strategic planning policy); Amends Senate Bylaw 10.1 which provides a listing of special agencies.

A coded memo from the Chancellor in 1987, provides the directive behind the guidance and establishment of Campus Budget Advisory Committees. Historically, S05-10 abolished the existing Budget Advisory Committee and replaced it with a Resource Planning Board. S07-3 then established a Resource Review Board noting that “In practice it was found that the role for the Resource Planning Board envisioned by S05-10 has proved to be unworkable due to budget timelines and the composition of the board. This proposal, if adopted, abolishes the Resource Planning Board and creates a new special agency, the Resource Review Board”. Subsequently S09-6 (Strategic Planning Policy) rescinded S07-3 and established a Strategic Planning Board which would serve as the budget advisory committee. SM-S11-1 then temporarily assigned responsibilities of the Budget Advisory Committee to the Senate Executive Committee (plus 3 additional members) noting that “the SPB has had limited meetings, due to management transitions and considerable uncertainty in the CSU budget. Those same budget uncertainties, however, make it all the more important that the Senate and the campus remain connected to the budget advisory role.” Finally, F14-1 revoked the temporary assignment of Budget Advisory Committee responsibilities and returned responsibilities to the Strategic Planning Board.

Whereas: S09-6, which defined the Strategic Planning Board as the body to serve in the role of a Budget Advisory Committee, is under reconsideration this fall, and

Whereas: The SJSU statement on shared governance notes that effective shared governance depends on judicious use of fully collaborative and consultative decision making, and

Whereas: The campus has not had an active budget advisory committee as called for in the 1987 coded memo from the Chancellor (BA 87-14) in recent years, therefore be it

Resolved: That until such time as S09-6 is updated, provisions in that policy related to a budget advisory committee be removed, and be it further

Resolved: That Senate bylaw 10.1 be amended to add the Budget Advisory Committee to the list of special agencies, and be it further

Resolved: That effective with the approval of this policy recommendation a special agency titled ‘Budget Advisory Committee’ be established in accordance with the structure, membership, and charge detailed below.

Rationale: A budget advisory committee is critically important in the areas of education, engagement, and transparency when it comes to (a) understanding our decentralized budgeting process, (b) identifying problem areas connected to budget allocations and expenditures, (c) serving in an advisory capacity to campus leadership highlighting issues and concerns from the Academic Senate and campus community on budget-related matters, and (d) serving as a resource to the campus community on budget-related

questions. This proposal is meant to provide for a budget advisory committee whose charge and responsibilities are in alignment with the principles articulated in the SJSU Statement on Shared Governance and provided by the System Budget Advisory Committee working with the Statewide Academic Senate and California State Student Association and endorsed by the CSU Chancellor in BA 87-14.

Approved: 9/28/15

Vote: 8-0-0

Present: Grosvenor, Mathur, Curry, Gleixner, Shifflett, Elmiaari, Beyersdorf, Becker

Absent: Laker

Financial Impact: None expected.

Workload Impact: Additional workload for members of the Budget Advisory Committee.

## **1. Budget Advisory Committee**

A Budget Advisory Committee is an integral part of the effort to engage the campus community in developing an understanding of our decentralized budgeting process. Working closely with the Vice President for Administration and Finance the Budget Advisory Committee will on a regular basis review reports related to budget/finance situations, identify areas of concern, and provide feedback and input on priorities and solutions. Meeting regularly, the Budget Advisory Committee will be in a good position to address and communicate budget issues to the Academic Senate and faculty as they emerge throughout an academic year.

The Budget Advisory Committee will be a special agency. In conducting their budget-related work, the President and the Budget Advisory Committee should remain cognizant of the principles in BA 87-14 (Chancellor's coded memo) regarding access to information and consultation. In collaboration with campus leadership, the Budget Advisory Committee should strive to serve the campus through education, communication, and transparency.

### **1.1 Charge**

The Budget Advisory Committee is charged with providing input and recommendations to the President throughout the planning, implementation and subsequent review of budget expenditures including advice on key campus priorities. The Budget Advisory Committee will assist with identifying challenges, serve as an advisory resource to the campus community, and provide a mechanism to communicate financial issues across the campus in a timely fashion. In addition, this committee will serve as a resource to enhance the campus community's understanding of university-wide budgeting processes; develop a broad and deep understanding of budget issues at all levels in order to identify and analyze problem areas and propose solutions; and provide advice concerning the planning, development, and implementation of materials to communicate budget-related information to the campus community.

### **1.2 Membership**

Senate Vice Chair (Co-chair)

VP Administration & Finance/CFO (Co-chair)

AVP Academic Budgets & Planning (EXO)

1 Dean

1 Department Chair

2 Faculty Senators  
2 Faculty-at-large  
AS President or Designee  
Academic Affairs Staff Member (finance/budget responsibilities)

#### 1.2.1 Recruitment and Appointment of Members

Members (other than ex-officio) serve a 3-year term which is renewable for one additional 3-year term. When filling initial appointments, the Chair of the Committee on Committees will stagger the terms of non ex-officio seats. The student member serves a 1-year term and can be re-appointed. Solicitation of applications to serve on the Budget Advisory Committee will be made through the normal Committee on Committees process for the seats designated for faculty, staff, dean, and student members. When multiple applications are submitted for a seat, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate will select individuals to serve. In considering applicants, attention should focus on the person's expertise in areas related to the planning and allocation of budget resources and the need for continuity over time in membership for a portion of the seats. In addition, to expand engagement in shared governance, efforts would be made to keep membership on the Budget Advisory Committee separate from that on the Strategic Planning Steering Committee.

#### 1.2.2 Interim Appointments.

When a seat will be vacant for no more than 1 semester (e.g., sabbatical) 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.

#### 1.2.3 Replacing Members

If a member is absent from three regularly scheduled committee meetings in an academic year, the chairs of the Budget Advisory Committee may request that the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate initiate action to recruit a replacement. If a member repeatedly does not perform assigned committee duties, the chairs of the Budget Advisory Committee may request that the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate initiate action to recruit a replacement.

### 1.3 Responsibilities

The co-chairs of the Budget Advisory Committee will convene and preside at meetings, prepare agendas, propose and maintain time-lines for its activities, and take responsibility for the effective operation of the committee. The BAC shall:

1.3.1 Participate in and facilitate a highly transparent, informative, and participatory campus budget planning and allocation process.

1.3.2 Participate in a budgeting process that integrates campus strategic goal setting, budget review and planning, and allocations set by the president.

- 151 1.3.3 Participate in the review of the accomplishment of finance goals across divisions and other  
152 appropriate units in the context of accountability with respect to the proper use of funds.  
153  
154 1.3.4 Advise the President regarding the timing and content of annual budget calls.  
155  
156 1.3.5 Advise the President during the fiscal year regarding significant or unanticipated events that have a  
157 significant effect upon campus budget allocations.  
158  
159 1.3.6 Advise the President regarding the content and format for reporting annual budget data to the  
160 campus community in a thorough and consistent manner such that annual changes in the budget are easily  
161 tracked and understood.  
162  
163 1.3.7 Provide annual recommendations to the President regarding the proposed budget allocations across  
164 the University's several divisions in line with the University Strategic Plan.  
165  
166 1.3.8 Receive reports related to enrollment targets and yield and contribute to discussions on proposed  
167 budget allocations.  
168  
169 1.3.9 Review, analyze, and advise the President regarding significant budget actions external to the  
170 campus that could impact the University's Operating Fund; e.g., the initial CSU budget proposal and the  
171 Governor's May Revise.  
172  
173 1.3.10 Provide information to the Strategic Planning Committee regarding the alignment of campus  
174 resources with the strategic plan.  
175

176 At the conclusion of each academic year the Vice Chair of the Senate will complete the summary report  
177 required of all special agencies and communicate, at an appropriate level of detail, information related to  
178 the Budget Advisory Committee's work directly to the Senate.  
179

## 180 **2. Considerations for the Budget Advisory Committee**

181  
182 Information and input from multiple sources and perspectives should be examined whenever  
183 possible. Information reported out to the campus community should be in a format that is readily  
184 understood and facilitates productive dialogue. The tenor and nature of communication with all  
185 individuals and groups providing and receiving budget-related information should be  
186 constructive, inclusive, and transparent.  
187

188 The Budget Advisory Committee may access as needed all documents related to the campus  
189 annual budget as well as expenditures. Committee members would receive the training needed to  
190 access available data.  
191

192 Given the complexity of our decentralized budgeting processes, the Budget Advisory Committee  
193 will need to become knowledgeable with regard to a wide range of SJSU resources, operations and  
194 organizations. These are likely to include the following:  
195

### 196 University

- 197 • Operating Fund Budget & Resources
- 198 • University Sources and Uses of Funds
- 199 • Expenditures by Division
- 200 • Comparisons to other CSU Campuses

- 202 Self Support Operations & Funds  
203     • Continuing Education Reserve Fund  
204     • Student Health  
205     • University Housing  
206     • University Parking  
207     • Capital Outlay & Deferred Maintenance  
208     • Intercollegiate Athletics  
209     • Lottery  
210     • Student Fees (e.g., Student Success, Excellence, & Technology Fee)

- 211  
212 Auxiliary Organizations  
213     • Associated Students  
214     • Research Foundation  
215     • Spartan Shops, Inc.  
216     • Student Union, Inc.  
217     • Tower Foundation

218  
219

### 220 **3.0 Policy Modifications**

221

222 Following implementation, if modifications to this policy appear needed the Vice Chair of the Senate will  
223 provide the Academic Senate Chair with the Budget Advisory Committee's suggestions. The Chair of the  
224 Academic Senate will then refer the recommendation(s) out to the appropriate policy committees for  
225 timely review and subsequent action.

## Policy Recommendation Credit by Exam for Challenge Examinations

**Background** SJSU has no campus policy governing Credit by Exam (CBE)- Challenge Exams. Current practices are not in line with most other CSU campuses or with guidelines given by the Chancellor's Office. CSU Executive Order 1036, Article 1.1 addresses "Campus-Originated Challenge Examinations" stating that "Students who pass campus-originated challenge examinations... shall earn credit toward the degree."

The Office of Academic Programs & Faculty Development of the CSU Chancellor's Office has informed the individual campuses that "challenge exams" should generate Earned Units toward graduation, but should never generate FTES (Full Time Equivalent Students). SJSU is among the 11 of 23 CSU Campuses not following these CSU Guidelines. The rationale is that students receive no instruction when challenging a course, and FTES is generated as a measure of faculty instructional time.

**Justification** Currently, SJSU students may earn credit by exam- challenge exams in two different ways. The color coding shows in **green** where we are complying with CSU policy, and in **red** where our campus is out of compliance.

### Current Practice

Type of Exam	Administered by	Earned Units toward graduation	Course registration required & FTES generated	Student fee
AP, CLEP, & IB	External Testing Services	Yes	No	Paid externally, unless administered by the SJSU Testing Office
"Challenge Exam" (to	Individual faculty or departments	Yes	Yes *	Course registration required; may

SJSU course)				require sizable tuition fees
--------------	--	--	--	------------------------------

\* Only the AP (Advanced Placement), CLEP (College Level Examination Program), and IB (International Baccalaureate) Exams comply with EO-1036 and guidance from the Academic Programs Division of the Chancellor's Office.

This policy proposes to administer "challenge exams" that do not generate FTES, but which do earn credit toward graduation. In table form, this policy will not modify the row associated with external examinations, but will modify the "challenge exams" as shown.

#### Proposed Policy

Type of Exam	Administered by	Earned Units toward graduation	Course registration required & FTES generated	Student fee
AP, CLEP, & IB	External Testing Services	Yes	No	paid externally, unless administered by the SJSU Testing Office
"Challenge Exam" (to SJSU course)	Departments or the Testing Office on behalf of a department	Yes	No	generally none, unless administered and/or evaluated by the Testing Office

**Resolved** That the existing "challenge exam" practices be discontinued and that the following be adopted immediately as campus policy for challenge examinations.

- A. **CBE- Challenge exams are not permitted to generate FTES, nor associated WTU (Weighted Teaching Units) workload.** Students are not eligible to take a CBE-Challenge exam for a particular course if that course has already been taken for a letter or CR/NC grade. A "W" grade shall not prevent a student from taking a CBE-Challenge exam. A student may not receive credit by examination via Challenge exam to remove a grade of "F," "WU", or "NC". Students shall not be allowed to take a campus generated challenge examination for a particular course more than once. As is current practice, if a challenge exam is passed, then a grade of CR and a notation of CBE shall be recorded on the transcript. Earned units (UE) must be generated and these must be recorded on

the SJSU transcript. Units earned through challenge exams will not be counted as part of the SJSU residency requirements. Only matriculated SJSU students are eligible to take CBE-Challenge exams.

- B. **Where there are existing AP or CLEP or IB exams** that have been determined to earn General Education (GE), American Institutions (AI), and/or course credit (see <http://info.sjsu.edu/static/catalog/cbe.html>), these external exams should be used rather than campus generated challenge exams. If there is a discrepancy between the units earned according to the CBE website and the units assigned to the articulated course at SJSU, the units found at the CBE website shall be assigned.
- C. **Where there are no external AP or CLEP or IB exams equivalent to SJSU courses**, the determination of whether “campus-originated challenge examinations” (per EO-1036) are available for a particular course is determined by the department or college curriculum committee, and not by individual faculty who may teach that course. A list of courses allowable for CBE via challenge exams shall be recommended by departments/colleges, approved by their respective Dean’s Offices, and maintained by the Office of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs. Credit by examination for 100W and for 200-level graduate courses are not eligible for CBE-Challenge Exams. Courses that are cross-listed will be determined by the home department following consultation with the other department.
- D. The Testing Office will oversee registration and reporting results of all campus challenge exams. The Testing Office can oversee administration of the exam and will coordinate with the department where needed. The Testing Office will determine the costs of administering the exams and propose a fee to the Course Fee Advisory Committee. Students must register for Challenge Exams with the Testing Office **no later** than 5:00 p.m., 28 days after the last day to add classes.
- E. The Registrar’s Office shall work with the Office of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs and the Testing Office to develop reporting forms, processes, and transcript notations consistent with this policy.

**Approved (C&R):** September 21, 2015

**Vote:** 9-0-0

**Present:** Buzanski, Bacich, Clements, Heil, Mathur, Matoush, Schultz-Krohn, Sibley, Stacks

**Absent:** Anagnos, Backer, Coopman

**Curricular Impact:** The net effect may be more students taking (and passing) courses with CBE- Challenge Exams. This in turn would lead to the freeing up of seats in classrooms, more timely graduation for those who pass the CBE- Challenge exams, and more access to enrollment of new students if the CBE- Challenge Exam students graduate more quickly.



99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108

- Financial Impact: As former challenge exams generated FTES and the proposed CBE-Challenge exams will not do so, these CBE exams could reduce campus FTES, though the effect is not anticipated to be very large.
- Workload Impact: There will be an initial staff and administrative workload associated with the creation of new reporting forms and processes consistent with this policy, primarily affecting the Registrar’s Office and the Office of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs. Systematizing the administration of SJSU CBE-Challenge exams could reduce faculty and staff workload.

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY  
Academic Senate  
Instruction & Student Affairs Committee  
October 5, 2015  
Final Reading

AS 1581

Policy recommendation:  
Establishing a committed presence in a class

Background: University policy S05-12 set the guidelines and some procedures for a refund schedule for students when they drop a class as well as for use of the "W" symbol on transcripts. According to that policy, instructors are permitted to drop students from in-person classes if they did not attend the first class meeting. Since that time, however, online classes have become far more prevalent, which has led to the question of how to track student commitment to a class that does not meet in person. This policy revision adds a clause to determine how students establish a committed presence in online classes (section 2b below). It also shortens the time during which students are required to establish their presence and makes the requirements parallel between in-person and online classes.

Resolved: The first full paragraph of Section 2 of S05-12 shall be modified to read:

Six instructional days before Census Day, i.e. the 14th day of instruction, is the last day for the student to add a class; this is also the last day for an instructor to drop a student who fails to establish a committed presence in the class. "Establishing a committed presence" is defined as the following options for the student:

- In-person classes. Attending the first class meeting or informing the instructor of the intention to continue in the class within 48 hours after the first official class meeting.
- Online classes. Logging on to the LMS the first day of the class or informing the instructor of the intention to continue in the class within 48 hours after the official class start date.

Approved:

Vote: 9/21/15

Present: 15-0-0

Walters, Sofish, Kelley, Kaufman, Sullivan-Green, Medina, Sen, Khan, Wilson, Branz (non-voting), Bruck (non-voting), Medrano, Gay,

Absent: Abdukheir, Amante, Brooks, Rees

Financial impact: Campsey

Workload impact: None.

None.

**SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**Academic Senate**  
**Instruction & Student Affairs Committee**  
**October 5, 2015**  
**First Reading**

**AS 1582**

**Policy Recommendation**  
**Academic Integrity**

Legislative history: Rescinds S07-2

Background: S07-2 laid out the University's Policy on Academic Integrity. Since that time, it has been determined that

- academic sanctions for infractions of academic integrity have been imposed in inconsistent ways across campus;
- student misconduct often goes unreported, resulting in a lack of university knowledge, input, and oversight and an inability of the university to recognize patterns of conduct;
- no formal grade appeal process currently exists for accused students who are found not responsible in the student conduct process or whose cases are dismissed.

Partly for these reasons, the University has not been in complete compliance with CSU executive orders on academic integrity (E.O. 1037, 1068, and 1098). This policy addresses the problems.

Resolved: That the attached be implemented as policy, rescinding S07-2.

Rationale: There is a need for faculty members to report all instances of academic misconduct and provide a complete record of accused students' academic performance; equal treatment demands it. The University can gain awareness of patterns of infraction only if it has a record of student infractions.

Student rights must also be upheld. Currently, student conduct violations and faculty academic sanctions are reviewed by the Office of Student Conduct and Ethical Development (SCED). When SCED reaches a finding in favor of the student – either the finding of not responsible or a lack of evidence of the violation – the faculty member may appeal the decision to the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR).

44 However, a student has no comparable avenue of appeal when the faculty  
45 member refuses to lift a sanction after a SCED finding in the student's  
46 favor. At present, faculty members who have imposed academic sanctions  
47 on students accused of misconduct are not required to remove those  
48 sanctions if the student is found not responsible by SCED. The BAFPR  
49 has both the expertise and infrastructure to review this kind of dispute  
50 regardless of which party brings the issue to BAFPR's attention.

51  
52 Approved: 9/21/15  
53 Vote: 15-0-0  
54 Present: Walters, Sofish, Kelley, Kaufman, Sullivan-Green, Medina, Sen,  
55 Khan, Wilson, Branz (non-voting), Bruck (non-voting), Medrano,  
56 Gay, Abdukheir, Amante, Brooks, Rees  
57 Absent: Campsey  
58 Financial Impact: None  
59 Workload Impact: Increase for members of the Board of Academic Freedom and  
60 Professional Responsibility  
61

62 **SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY**  
63 **POLICY ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY**  
64

65 The university emphasizes responsible citizenship and an awareness of ethical choices  
66 inherent in human development. Academic honesty and fairness foster ethical  
67 standards for all those who rely on the integrity of the university, its courses, and its  
68 degrees. University degrees are compromised and the public is defrauded if faculty  
69 members or students knowingly or unwittingly allow dishonest acts to be rewarded  
70 academically.

71  
72 This policy sets the standards for such integrity and shall be used to inform students,  
73 faculty, and staff of the university's Academic Integrity Policy.  
74

75 **STUDENT ROLE**  
76

77 The San José State University Academic Integrity Policy requires that each student  
78

- 79 1. know the rules that preserve academic integrity and abide by them at all times,  
80 including learning and abiding by rules associated with specific classes, exams, and  
81 course assignments;  
82  
83 2. know the consequences of violating the Academic Integrity Policy;  
84  
85 3. know the appeal rights and procedures to be followed in the event of an appeal;  
86  
87 4. foster academic integrity among peers.  
88

89 **FACULTY ROLE**  
90

91 The San José State University Academic Integrity Policy requires that each faculty  
92 member  
93

- 94 1. provide a clear and concise course syllabus that apprises students of the Academic  
95 Integrity Policy and the ethical standards and supporting procedures required in a  
96 course;  
97  
98 2. make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct. Specifically,  
99 examinations should be appropriately proctored or monitored by university personnel  
100 to prevent students from copying, using non-cited resources, or exchanging  
101 information. Examinations and answers to examination questions should be kept  
102 private. Efforts should be made to give unique and varied assignments;

- 103  
104 3. take action against a student in accordance with this policy when supporting  
105 evidence indicates that the student has violated the Academic Integrity Policy;  
106  
107 4. comply with the rules and standards of the Academic Integrity Policy.  
108

## 109 **ROLE OF THE OFFICE OF STUDENT CONDUCT** 110 **AND ETHICAL DEVELOPMENT** 111

112 The San José State University Academic Integrity Policy requires that the student  
113 conduct administrator, the Director of the Office of Student Conduct and Ethical  
114 Development (SCED),  
115

- 116 1. comply with and enforce the Student Conduct Code<sup>1</sup>, which includes the Academic  
117 Integrity Policy;  
118  
119 2. adjudicate student conduct cases and assign administrative sanctions to students  
120 who have violated the Student Conduct Code;  
121  
122 3. serve as a resource for faculty, staff, and students on matters of academic integrity  
123 and this policy;  
124  
125 4. ensure dissemination of the policy to the campus community when changes are  
126 made to the policy or procedures.  
127

### 128 **1.0 DEFINITIONS OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY** 129

#### 130 **1.1 CHEATING** 131

132 San José State University defines cheating as the act of obtaining or attempting  
133 to obtain credit for academic work through the use of any dishonest, deceptive,  
134 or fraudulent means. Cheating includes  
135

- 136 1.1.1 copying, in part or as a whole, from another's test or other  
137 evaluation instrument, including homework assignments,  
138 worksheets, lab reports, essays, summaries, and quizzes;  
139  
140 1.1.2 submitting work previously graded in another course without prior  
141 approval by the course instructor or by departmental policy;  
142

---

<sup>1</sup> Currently available at  
<http://www.sjsu.edu/studentconduct/docs/Student%20Conduct%20Code%202013.pdf>.

- 1.1.3 submitting work simultaneously presented in two courses without prior approval of both course instructors or by the departmental policies of both departments;
- 1.1.4 using or consulting sources, tools, or materials prohibited by the instructor prior to or during an examination;
- 1.1.5 altering or interfering with the grading process;
- 1.1.6 sitting for an examination by a surrogate or as a surrogate;
- 1.1.7 any other act committed by a student in the course of his or her academic work that defrauds or misrepresents, including aiding others in any of the actions defined above.

## 1.2 **PLAGIARISM**

San José State University defines plagiarism as the act of representing the work of another as one's own without giving appropriate credit, regardless of how that work was obtained, and submitting it to fulfill academic requirements.

Plagiarism includes

- 1.2.1 knowingly or unknowingly incorporating the ideas, words, sentences, paragraphs, parts of sentences or paragraphs, or the specific substance of another's work without giving appropriate credit, and representing the product as one's own work;
- 1.2.2 representing another's artistic or scholarly works, such as computer programs, instrument printouts, inventions, musical compositions, photographs, paintings, drawings, sculptures, novels, short stories, poems, screen plays, or television scripts, as one's own.

## 2.0 **NOTIFICATION OF STANDARDS OF DETECTING PLAGIARISM**

San José State University or its faculty may subscribe to or use plagiarism-detection services. Any plagiarism-detection service used by faculty or with which San José State University contracts shall ensure compliance with FERPA, university data security policies, and accessibility requirements.

Except for the stated purpose of storing submitted work in databases solely for the purpose of detecting plagiarism, any plagiarism-detection service with which San José State University contracts shall, to the fullest extent possible, agree to assure that

ownership rights of all submitted work shall remain with the work's author and not with the plagiarism-detection service.

### 3.0 **SANCTIONS**

There shall be two major classifications of sanctions that may be imposed for violations of this policy: academic and administrative. Academic sanctions are actions related to coursework or grades and are determined by the faculty member. Administrative sanctions are actions that address a student's status on campus and are determined by SCED. Academic sanctions and administrative sanctions may be imposed simultaneously.

#### 3.1 **ACADEMIC SANCTIONS**

Faculty members are responsible for determining academic sanctions. Faculty members may find it helpful to consult with their department chair or school director, senior faculty members, or the director of SCED in consideration of appropriate academic sanctions. Such sanctions shall be proportional to the offense. The academic sanction is usually a form of "grade modification." Before sanctions can be employed, the faculty member must have verified the instance(s) of academic dishonesty by personal observation or documentation. The faculty member is expected to maintain in confidence notes and communications between the student and the faculty member as they may be relevant in subsequent disciplinary proceedings or any subsequent legal actions.

Recommended academic sanctions include

3.1.1 oral reprimand;

3.1.2 repetition of the assignment with sufficient change in instructions such that none of the original assignment can be utilized;

3.1.3 lower grade on the evaluation instrument;

3.1.4 failure on the evaluation instrument;

3.1.5 reduction in course grade;

3.1.6 failure in the course;

3.1.7 recommendation of additional administrative sanctions (SCED to review for possible violations of the Student Conduct Code).



### ***Faculty Discretion***

Incidents involving the careless or inept handling of quoted material that fall short of the definitions of cheating or plagiarism, as defined in Items 1.1 and 1.2 of this policy, may be dealt with at the discretion of the faculty member concerned.

The faculty member also has the discretion and obligation to determine whether specific acts by a student fall under the description in 1.1.7.

## **3.2 ADMINISTRATIVE SANCTIONS**

As stipulated in Executive Order 1098 (Student Conduct Procedures), violations of the Student Conduct Code (Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations Section 41301), including cheating or plagiarism in connection with an academic program, may warrant expulsion, suspension, probation, or a lesser sanction. Administrative action involving academic dishonesty shall be the responsibility of SCED. SCED shall respond to referrals from the faculty of violations of the Academic Integrity Policy. It shall further respond to repeat violations as brought to its attention by the centralized reports filed with SCED.

SCED shall notify faculty members when action has been taken. It shall maintain a record of students who have been reported for violating the Academic Integrity Policy.

## **4.0 EVALUATION AND REPORTING**

When a faculty member suspects a violation of the Academic Integrity Policy and is in possession of evidence to substantiate that violation (not excluding a statement of personal observation of the infraction by the faculty member or other SJSU personnel or students in the class), it is the faculty member's responsibility to take the following steps:

- 4.1 Confront the situation discretely; that is, faculty members shall not discuss specific charges of cheating, plagiarism, or any other violations involving specific individuals in the classroom or elsewhere before other members of the class.
- 4.2 Communicate with the student concerning the alleged violation and arrange for a conference to present documentation. In this conference, the student should be advised of the allegation and be made aware of the supporting evidence and probable consequences. The student should be provided the opportunity to provide his/her perspective and respond to the

allegation. Faculty members should make their best effort to meet with the student in person, but if that is not feasible, they can communicate in writing. The faculty member is expected to maintain in confidence notes and communications between the student and the faculty member except as they may be relevant in subsequent disciplinary proceedings or any subsequent legal actions.

4.3 Inform the student of the sanctions imposed in accordance with Section 4.0 if the faculty member still believes that a violation of the Academic Integrity Policy has occurred.

4.4 Report the alleged violation and the action taken to SCED on the Academic Integrity Reporting Form<sup>2</sup>. The form identifies the faculty member, student involved, and type of violation (cheating or plagiarism) and includes a description of the incident and the academic sanctions imposed. SCED shall review the academic sanctions imposed by the faculty member and determine whether they are justified in light of the provisions of the Student Conduct Code and commensurate with university norms of severity. SCED shall further determine whether it will impose administrative sanctions. The faculty member must submit a copy of the supporting documentation to the Academic Integrity Reporting Form. After this initial report, no additional academic sanctions may be levied. Academic sanctions may not be imposed without a report to SCED. Should the faculty member neglect to file an appropriate report to SCED, any academic sanction imposed is invalid until the report is filed. All instances of ethical misconduct should be known to the university and reported to SCED. They should be reviewable and alterable by university oversight personnel, specifically the Director of SCED.

4.5 The instructor may impose the academic sanction and make the report called for in Section 4.4 without a conference when a student fails to attend a scheduled conference or discuss the alleged dishonesty and the faculty member makes a good-faith, albeit unsuccessful, effort to contact the student in writing. In either case, the student's right to appeal is preserved.

## 5.0 PROTECTION OF STUDENT RIGHTS

---

<sup>2</sup> Currently available at [https://publicdocs.maxient.com/reportingform.php?SanJoseStateUniv&layout\\_id=2](https://publicdocs.maxient.com/reportingform.php?SanJoseStateUniv&layout_id=2). Reporting of infractions is mandated by CSU Executive Order 1098.

- 5.1 Students are guaranteed due process, including the right to be informed of the charges and nature of the evidence supporting the charges and to have a meeting with the faculty member, SCED, or other decision makers. At any such meeting, statements and evidence on behalf of the student may be submitted. This policy is not intended to deny the right to appeal of any decision through appropriate university channels.
- 5.2 SCED shall review the academic sanction imposed by a faculty member on a student and determine whether evidence exists in support of the instructor's allegation. It shall also make an assessment of the proportionality of the sanction to the severity of the infraction and may recommend a reduction or increase in sanction severity. This assessment shall be made in consideration of consistency across the campus.
- 5.3 If upon review by SCED, the student is found not responsible of the charges or if insufficient evidence has been presented by the instructor to establish responsibility, then the student shall be exonerated and the case dismissed. In this event, the record of the alleged violation shall be expunged and academic sanctions against the student prohibited, barring an appeal by the faculty member to the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR). If SCED finds that sanctions should be modified, the instructor must make those modifications, again barring an appeal by the faculty member to the BAFPR. Should the instructor refuse to lift or modify the sanctions recommended by SCED, the case shall be referred to the BAFPR. This section represents an exception to University Policy S99-9, Section IV.2.
- 5.4 If the BAFPR upholds the findings of SCED to exonerate the student or to modify the sanction, the instructor must lift the sanction imposed or modify it accordingly. If the instructor refuses to do so, as per CSU Executive Order 1037, "it is the responsibility of other qualified faculty to do so ... [i.e.] one or more persons with academic training comparable to the instructor of record who are presently on the faculty at that campus." Preferably, the department chair or school director, in conjunction with associate dean of the relevant college, shall be compelled to do so. If the remedial action has not been taken within a reasonable time as determined by the BAFPR, a request to the President, Provost or appropriate vice president shall be made to expedite the resolution.
- 5.5 All reasonable accommodations shall then be provided to the exonerated student if there is a fear of retaliation by the instructor. Accommodations might include the ability to retake the course without charge from a different instructor or to substitute a different course (the latter if approved

by the student's advisor). If retaking the same course, credit for assignments completed in the previous attempt shall be afforded if comparable. Academic standing shall be returned to its status before the imposition of a reversed sanction.

- 5.4 **Student Appeal Process.** An appeal must be filed in writing to the BAFPR before the last day of instruction of the semester following that in which the academic sanction was imposed. The sanctions imposed and the SCED findings shall be taken up by the BAFPR within 30 days of the official filing of the appeal. Evidence submitted by both student and faculty member shall be considered and the determination of responsibility shall be assessed.

## 6.0 THREATS

Threats against any member of the faculty as a consequence of implementing this policy on academic integrity shall be cause for disciplinary action under the Student Conduct Code (Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations Section 41301), and may also result in civil and criminal action.

## 7.0 DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION

- 7.1 The Academic Integrity Policy shall be published in the university catalog and on the university website. Copies of this policy shall also be held in every department office and SCED.
- 7.2 Dissemination of this information shall be the responsibility of SCED. Information is available at <http://www.sjsu.edu/studentconduct/>.
- 7.3 SCED shall submit a statistical report on the number and types of violations and their eventual disposition to the Academic Senate annually.
- 7.4 College and departments/schools are encouraged to discuss periodically this policy at faculty meetings, including discussion of strategies for ensuring academic integrity among students and consistency among faculty.
- 7.5 Department chairs, school directors, and program directors should ensure that new faculty members receive a copy of this policy and an oral explanation at the time they are given their first class assignment.

## Policy Recommendation Internships and Service Learning

Whereas CSU Executive Order 1064 "...recognizes the beneficial educational purpose of student internships, as well as the need to maximize the educational experience while mitigating the risks to participants and minimizing the university's liability exposure;" and furthermore requires each campus "to develop, implement, maintain and publish a student internship policy..."; and

Whereas Both internships and service learning have been recognized as two of ten "High-Impact Educational Practices" (HIPs) by the Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U) (<https://www.aacu.org/leap/hips>); and by the CSU as well; and

Whereas SJSU provides significant opportunities for Service Learning through the Center for Community Learning & Leadership (CCLL), and extensive opportunities for internships in many departments (the majority of SJSU departments offer either service learning or internships), all of which are credit bearing and are therefore covered by Executive Order 1064; and

Whereas An *ad hoc* committee with representation and input from three university divisions, Administration and Finance (Contracts and Purchasing; and Risk Management), Student Affairs (Career Center), and Academic Affairs (CCLL and Undergraduate Studies) worked for 2 years on the development of this policy and University-Organization Agreement (UOA), and a larger *ad hoc* committee (IFAC, Internship Faculty Advisory Committee) created in Fall 2014, including additional representation from the seven academic colleges, has given final input on all aspects of this policy and the UOA; therefore be it

Resolved That a University-Organization Agreement (UOA) be created, consistent with the CSU system requirements, and legally overseen and maintained by SJSU Contracts and Purchasing; and be it further

Resolved That the student's individual Learning Plan (LP) and Participation Guidelines (PG) be created to insure that the non-SJSU learning site, the faculty member coordinating and overseeing the internship or service learning, and the students involved all agree about the nature of the academic requirements and expected outcomes for the internship or service learning course; and be it further

45  
 46 Resolved That the outcomes of the LP and PG relate to the course learning outcomes or  
 47 the program learning outcomes; and be it further  
 48  
 49 Resolved That full implementation of UOA, LP, and PG documents; and training as  
 50 necessary be developed and overseen by the Center for Community Learning  
 51 and Leadership (CCLL) on behalf of the Office of Graduate and Undergraduate  
 52 Programs; and be it further  
 53  
 54 Resolved That all learning sites be entered into the CSU database in a timely fashion  
 55 consistent with the development of this system-wide database, and the training of  
 56 SJSU faculty and staff with its implementation;  
 57  
 58 Resolved This policy is effective Fall 2016.  
 59  
 60 **Approved (C&R):** September 28, 2015  
 61 **Vote:** 9-1-0  
 62 **Present:** Anagnos, Bacich, Backer, Buzanski, Clements, Coopman, Heil, Mathur,  
 63 Sibley, Stacks  
 64 **Absent:** Matoush, Romero, Schultz-Krohn  
 65  
 66 Curricular Impact: This policy will bring SJSU into compliance with the governing CSU  
 67 Executive Order. It will also establish procedures to document that credit-  
 68 bearing internships and service learning courses have established  
 69 learning goals.  
 70  
 71 Financial Impact: Very closely tied to the Workload Impact.  
 72  
 73 Workload Impact: Workload will involve time spent orienting students to these requirements;  
 74 time spent in coordination with organizations, SJSU C&PS, and the  
 75 students in handling/processing the required forms (LP, PG, UOA); and  
 76 time spent maintaining updated information on the status of these forms  
 77 and our partnering organizations.  
 78  
 79 Workload impact will be closely tied to the following factors:  
 80 - the number of students enrolled in a given department's  
 81 internship program  
 82 - the total number of organizations at which the department's  
 83 students are interning  
 84 - what percentage of the organizations that a department is  
 85 working with already have a nonexpired UOA on file  
 86 - to what extent new organizations in the process of signing a  
 87 UOA request changes/amendments to their agreements  
 88  
 89 Workload impact will be also be tied to the agreed upon processes for  
 90 handling UOAs within SJSU. Currently departments are required to create

91 purchase orders and generate requisition numbers for each new UOA,  
92 before sending them to C&PS.

San José State University  
Academic Senate  
Organization and Government Committee  
October 5, 2015  
Final Reading

AS 1584

Policy Recommendation  
Rescinding Outdated Policy (S98-11) Related to the 1998 GE Guidelines

Legislative History: Modifies S14-5 which replaced the 2009 revision of the 2005 GE Guidelines.

Whereas: An oversight in past policy updates never rescinded S98-11, and  
Whereas: The 1998 GE guidelines have been superseded, therefore, be it  
Resolved: That the first resolved statement in S14-5 be modified as follows:

Effective Fall 2014, S98-11 (Approval of General Education Program Guidelines), (S09-2 (Amends the 2005 General Education Guidelines), S05-8 (Revision and Reissuance of the GE Guidelines), S12 9 (Temporary Suspension of Enforcement of the Requirement that Students must Enroll in Courses for Areas R, S, and V in SJSU Studies in Three Different Departments), S11-3 (2.0 GPA Graduation Requirement for the GE Portion of SJSU Studies), and S01-14 (Foreign Language Classes and General Education) be rescinded. That these Guidelines (complying with the LEAP framework, the recommended changes to writing intensive courses, resolving inconsistencies and inaccuracies, and formatted as an accessible document) replace the 2009 Revision (S09-2) of the 2005 GE Guidelines (S05-8); and be it further

Rationale: Presently, S98-11 is listed as 'active' policy yet has clearly been replaced by the 2005 guidelines, the 2009 guidelines, and more recently the 2014 guidelines. To correct this oversight, this proposal modifies S14-5 so as to rescind S98-11 along with the other superseded policies.

Approved: Date goes here

Vote:

Present: Grosvenor, Mathur, Beyersdorf, Becker, Curry, Gleixner, Elmiaari, Shifflett

Absent: Laker

Financial Impact: None

Workload Impact: None



San José State University  
Academic Senate  
Organization and Government Committee  
October 5, 2015  
First Reading

AS 1585

Policy Recommendation  
Updating the Board of General Studies Membership, Charge, and Responsibilities

Legislative History: Rescinds S02-7 and S96-9 which covered the structure and procedures for the Board of General studies. The language in S02-7 said “Resolved: that University Policy S96-9 be amended and replaced as follows”, however, the record shows S02-7 as having modified rather than rescinding S96-9.

Whereas: Assessing each of five core competencies at the university level is required by WASC, and

Whereas: SJSU needs to develop methods and procedures for assessing each of the core competencies, and

Whereas: The Board of General Studies (BOGS) has the breadth and depth of understanding of the curricula and courses where the core competencies are developed, and

Whereas: A request has been made to review the membership of the BOGS along with who should chair this committee, and

Whereas: Addition of the Director of Assessment to BOGS could facilitate the work of this committee, and

Whereas: Recently substantial changes have been made to our General Education program (see 2014 Guidelines for General Education [GE], American Institutions [AI], and the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement [GWAR]) in part to (a) respond to Executive Order 1100 (EO-1100) governing GE, and to (b) define categories for double counting in the major to help high-unit degree programs comply with the CSU’s 120 unit degree program requirement, and

Whereas: Sections of S02-7 are outdated, therefore be it

Resolved That S96-9 and S02-7 be rescinded and replaced with the information provided in this policy recommendation.

Rationale: In the process of working on two separate referrals that impact S02-7, it was noted that additional items in S02-7 need updating and that S96-9 had been superseded by S02-7. O&G discussed (on 8/24) combining referrals related to S02-7 into one policy recommendation replacing S02-7. The first referral pertained to the assessment of core competencies. The second item was related to BOGS membership. A third referral focused on the need to update S02-7 with respect to duplication of content in the 2014 Guidelines, references to CSU executive order 1100, assessment, and deletion of sections no longer relevant. Hence, this policy recommendation provides an update of University Policy with respect to the membership, charge, and responsibilities of BOGS and keeps the content of this policy distinct from information in the 2014 Guidelines for GE, AI, and GWAR.

Core Competencies: BOGS has the experience necessary to facilitate wide-ranging dialogues with faculty regarding methods, procedures, and the infrastructure needed to develop and implement strategies to evaluate core competencies. If there are policy or senate management implications that emerge, BOGS can bring recommendations to the senate via the Curriculum & Research Committee for referral to a policy committee as needed.

BOGS Membership: The changes proposed brings policy language up to date to reflect our structure of seven rather than eight colleges and provides support, through addition of the Director of Assessment, for the ongoing work of the Board with respect to the assessment of curricula and courses. In addition, it provides for the appointment of a faculty member to chair the Board.

Additional updates to S02-7. Updates are needed to remove content that duplicates information in the 2014 Guidelines for GE, AI, and GWAR (hereafter referred to as Guidelines). This also results in keeping all content regarding the structure, definitions, and procedures related to GE in one location - namely the Guidelines and consolidating information regarding the charge, membership, and responsibilities of BOGs in this policy recommendation. Section V from S02-7 is obsolete and needs to be deleted as it pertains to a call for a complete review of the GE program be conducted in 2005.

Section moved here during 9/21 meeting  
Summary of changes:

- Updates titles.
- Membership updates. BOGS shall consist of ten members: seven teaching faculty (representing seven colleges), one student, the AVP for Graduate & Undergraduate Programs or designee (EXO; non voting), and the Director of Assessment (EXO; non voting).
- Establishing a faculty chair. The Chair shall be a faculty member with at least one year of service on the Board.
- Modification with respect to voting. Ex officio members will be non-voting members with the exception that in the case of ties, the AVP for Graduate & Undergraduate Programs or designee may vote.
- Updates information related to CSU Executive Order.
- Updates policy to accurately reflect current practices in BOGS in alignment with the Guidelines.
- Adds information related to assessment of core competencies to the Board's responsibilities.

Approved: 9/28/15

Vote: 8-0-0

Present: Grosvenor, Mathur, Curry, Shifflett, Elmiaari, Beyersdorf, Gleixner, Becker

Absent: Laker

Financial Impact: None expected

Workload Impact: No change from current situation

Board of General Studies Membership, Charge, and Responsibilities

**1. Board of General Studies**

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 6.2.3 notes that “each campus shall have a broadly representative standing committee, a majority of which shall be instructional faculty, and which shall also include student membership, to provide for appropriate oversight and to make appropriate recommendations concerning the implementation, conduct and evaluation of these requirements.”

**1.1 Charge**

BOGS Solicits courses and curricular proposals designed to satisfy GE, AI, and GVAR requirements from all colleges and departments of the University; reviews, approves, and authorizes courses and curricular proposals for purposes of GE, AI, and GVAR; and evaluates the courses and curricula it has approved according to procedures described in the 2014 Guidelines. The Board approves modifications requested by degree programs in accordance with the 2014 Guidelines.

**1.2 Membership**

AVP Graduate & Undergraduate Programs or designee (EXO, non voting)  
Director of Assessment (EXO, non voting)  
1 faculty Applied Sciences & Arts  
1 faculty Business  
1 faculty Education  
1 faculty Engineering  
1 faculty Humanities & Art  
1 faculty Science  
1 faculty Social Sciences  
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.

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.

**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 BOGS may request that the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate initiate action leading to the election of a new member. If a member repeatedly does not perform assigned committee duties, the chair of BOGS may request that the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate initiate action leading to the election of a new member.

### ***1.3 Responsibilities of the Board of General Studies***

**1.3.1** The Board shall report to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

**1.3.2** Members are expected to know the current Guidelines for GE, AI, and GEAR.

**1.3.3** The Board shall actively solicit courses and curricular proposals designed to satisfy General Education requirements from all colleges and departments of the University, shall review, and where appropriate approve courses and curricular proposals for purposes of General Education, and shall evaluate existing GE, AI, and GEAR courses and curricula.

174 **1.3.4** The Board, in consultation with the appropriate college deans and department  
175 chairpersons, shall provide for and approve modifications to requirements requested by degree  
176 programs in accordance with the 2014 Guidelines.

177 **1.3.5** The Board shall consider petitions from programs for relief from the fifty-one semester  
178 hour General Education requirement. Petitions shall be approved whenever the total number of  
179 units required for purposes of formal accreditation of the program, plus the units required for  
180 General Education, exceed the maximum number of units that can be required for the degree  
181 under Trustee regulations.

182 **1.3.6** Policy proposals affecting General Education curricula shall be brought to the Academic  
183 Senate by the Curriculum and Research Committee. The Organization and Government  
184 Committee shall present policy proposals relating to charge, membership, and responsibilities of  
185 BOGS.

186 **1.3.7** Annually, early in Fall Semester, the Board shall present to the Senate (through Curriculum  
187 and Research Committee) a report on its activities for the preceding academic year.

188 **1.3.8** The Board shall, in consultation with the Director of Assessment and the Director for  
189 Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics, develop and implement strategies for the periodic  
190 evaluation of these core competencies: Information Literacy, Written Communication, Oral  
191 Communication, Critical Thinking, and Quantitative Reasoning. If there are policy or senate  
192 management implications that emerge, BOGS will bring recommendations to the senate via the  
193 Curriculum & Research Committee for referral to a policy committee as needed.

194 **1.3.9** In accordance with the 2014 Guidelines, BOGS is responsible for the assessment and  
195 continuing certification of GE courses.

## 196 **1.4 *Procedures***

197 The following shall apply to the proceedings of BOGS:

198 **1.4.1** Meetings of the Board shall be open to the campus community, except in cases where  
199 BOGS elects to conduct votes in closed session.

200 **1.4.2** Departmental representatives (normally course coordinators and chairs/directors) shall be  
201 invited in a timely manner by BOGS to attend all Board meetings at which their course(s) will be  
202 discussed.

203 **1.4.3** If the Board denies certification of a new course, it shall provide the course coordinator  
204 with written feedback, explaining the reasons for denial. If the Board recommends to the  
205 Curriculum and Research (C&R) Committee that a course be decertified, it shall provide C& R  
206 and the course coordinator with written feedback explaining the reasons for the recommended  
207 decertification. For both new and continuing certification, the Board may not raise in subsequent  
208 proceedings on the same course additional objections, except those that apply to new materials  
209 submitted.

210 **1.4.4** If the Board proposes guidelines regarding criteria for certification or continuing  
211 certification in addition to those prescribed by University policy, these guidelines shall be  
212 submitted to the Curriculum and Research Committee for policy review and will subsequently be  
213 made available to all course coordinators.

214 The Board may make additional rules for the conduct of its proceedings, but they must be  
215 consistent with University policy.

216 **2. Subsequent Review**

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

San José State University  
Academic Senate  
Organization and Government Committee  
October 5, 2015  
First Reading

AS 1586

Policy Recommendation  
Modification of Human Subjects Institutional Review Board Membership

Legislative History: Amends S08-7 - Policy for Protection of Human Research Subjects. SM-F05-1 created an IRB-HS task force whose work culminated in S08-7. SM-F05-2 added members (CASA, Social Sciences, Education) to the Institutional Review Board - Human Subjects. SM05-3 added to the IRB-HS charge that the Board may also provide information to the campus on IRB\_HS procedures, compliance, rules and regulations. SM-S00-1 provided for one faculty member from each Senate representative unit.

Whereas: The Institutional Review Board – Human Subjects (IRB-HS) requested a referral to the Organization and Governance Committee regarding membership and voting, and  
Whereas: Structural changes in Academic Affairs have an impact on titles and representation on existing committees; and  
Whereas: There is a clear need for members to have substantial experience and knowledge in the administration of federal, state, and SJSU regulations and policies that pertain to research with human subjects; therefore be it  
Resolved: That University Policy S08-7 be amended to reflect the revisions detailed below.

Rationale: Effective review of IRB protocols requires that the committee members have significant training in, and knowledge of, federal, state, and SJSU regulations and policies that pertain to research with human subjects. For that reason, the committee functions more effectively (i.e., reviews protocols more consistently and more accurately) when the board includes a substantial number members who have been on the committee for a longer period of time. The change to designation of the physician member to a consultant (as needed) reflects the fact, grounded in experience, that this person is not needed for the review of all protocols. Finally, for compliance reasons the IRB coordinator needs to be a voting member of the IRB-HS. Federal regulations for the Protection of Human Subjects allow for an expedited review procedure for minor changes to previously approved research and for continuing review of research if the original review was also conducted through an expedited review and the research continues to be minimal risk. According to the regulations an expedited review “may be carried out by the IRB chairperson or by one or more experienced reviewers designated by the chairperson from among the members of the IRB.” In our case, that person is the IRB coordinator. The implication is that the member carrying out the review has voting status because they “can exercise all of the authorities of the IRB except that the reviewer may not disapprove the research.” (45 CFR 46.110(b))

**Proposed Changes** (to section VI.A.4 of S08-7):

Delete Associate Dean of Graduate Studies

Add Associate Dean of Research

Make the IRB Coordinator Seat ex officio - voting

Modify physician seat to reflect the need for a Kinesiological Consultant with a term of 'as needed'

Add a section VI.A.4.e that reads:

Recruitment and Appointment of Members.

- (1) Each faculty member serves a 3-year term renewable for one additional 3-year term. Student and community members serve 1-year terms. Recruitment of faculty and student members to serve on the IRB-HS will be done through the normal Committee on Committees process for the seats designated for faculty and student members.
- (2) All applicants will submit a one page written statement describing their qualifications to serve on the board. It is strongly recommended that applicants attach their certificate verifying completion of one of the online CITI (Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative) human subjects research courses (see <http://www.sjsu.edu/research/irb/irb-researcher-training/index.html>). Upon appointment members must complete one of the online CITI courses prior to attending the first scheduled meeting.
- (3) Recommendations for a physician to serve as Kinesiological Consultant will be solicited from the SJSU Kinesiology Department Chair.
- (4) When there are multiple applications for any seat the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate will select individuals to serve. In considering potential IRB-HS members attention should focus on the person's research skills and experience and careful consideration of the balance of new and continuing members so the board retains experienced members yet also brings on new members.

Approved: 9/28/15

Vote: 8-0-0

Present: Grosvenor, Beyersdorf, Mathur, Curry, Gleixner, Shifflett, Becker, Elmiaari

Absent: Laker

Financial Impact: None expected

Workload Impact: No change from current situation

**Complete membership list:**

IRB Coordinator (EXO)

Associate Dean of Research (EXO)

2 Faculty, Applied Sciences & Arts

1 Faculty, Business

2 Faculty, Education

1 Faculty, Engineering



93	1 Faculty, General Unit
94	1 Faculty, Humanities & the Arts
95	1 Faculty, Science
96	2 Faculty, Social Sciences
97	1 Student
98	1 Community-at-large (1 year appointment)
99	1 Physician or Licensed Health Professional
100	1 Physician (Kinesiological Consultant) (term: as needed)
101	1 Prisoner Advocate (term: as needed)
102	

San José State University  
Academic Senate  
Organization and Government Committee  
October 5, 2015  
Final Reading

AS 1587

Senate Management Resolution  
Dissolving the Heritage, Preservation & Public History Committee

Legislative History and Background: S05-5 created the Heritage, Preservation & Public History Committee with a charge to “advise the Senate and the President and propose resolutions and policies as appropriate” with regard to preserving buildings, sites, papers and other items related to SJSU’s history. SM-S09-1 changed the membership to remove the SJSU History Webmaster. The referral to the O&G committee in March of 2013 noted that the chair of the Committee on Committees and the chair of the Heritage, Preservation & Public History Committee were having difficulty finding individuals to serve in the 11 open seats at the time.

Whereas: The Heritage, Preservation & Public History Committee has not been engaged in much activity in recent years; and

Whereas: The Heritage, Preservation & Public History Committee voted this fall to dissolve the committee; therefore be it

Resolved: That the Heritage, Preservation & Public History Committee be dissolved effective with the approval of this resolution, and be it further

Resolved: That S08-4 (Campus Planning Board) be modified to add a third item (2.c) to the Campus Planning Board’s responsibilities as follows: As needed provide advice to the President on matters related to historical buildings and grounds.

Rationale: Minutes from the fall 2013 O&G meeting with the chair of the Heritage, Preservation & Public History Committee noted as challenges for the committee: lack of participation, type of participation, lack of financial support, no champion, no significant action items or substance. The question was raised at that time about dissolving the committee. The referral (which originated with the committee chair) to the O&G committee also noted that the public history component of the committee’s charge had not been addressed over the eight years since the committee was formed. This fall, members of the Heritage, Preservation & Public History Committee met and voted to dissolve the committee. In addition, components of the committee’s charge are embedded in other committee’s work: The new library policy has language specific to the preservation of materials unique to SJSU, rare and valuable materials, and materials relevant for historical research; the campus planning board has responsibilities that include advising the president regarding the planning, location, construction and operation of structures, facilities, plantings, and landscape design. Therefore, at this point in time the Heritage, Preservation & Public History Committee should be dissolved.

44    Approved: 9/28/15  
45    Vote: 8-0-0  
46    Present: Grosvenor, Mathur, Curry, Shifflett, Elmiaari, Gleixner, Becker, Beyersdorf  
47    Absent: Laker  
48  
49  
50    Financial Impact: None  
51    Workload Impact: None  
52

San Jose State University  
Academic Senate  
Organization and Government Committee  
October 5, 2015  
First Reading

AS 1588

Policy Recommendation  
Revision: Faculty Athletics Representative Policy

Legislative History: Rescinds F05-2 which is our current policy regarding the faculty athletics representative.

Articles 4, 5 and 6 of the NCAA Constitution recognize the involvement of faculty athletics representatives in the organization, legislative authority and legislative process of the NCAA and the important role of faculty athletics representatives in the local institutional control of intercollegiate athletics programs. Specifically, the NCAA Manuals indicate the following:

- Each member institution is required to appoint a faculty athletics representative. [Constitution 6.1.3]
- Qualifications of those who may serve as faculty athletics representatives are described in Constitution 6.1.3: A member institution shall elect an individual to serve as faculty athletics representative. An individual so designated after January 12, 1989, shall be a member of the institution's faculty or an administrator who holds faculty rank and shall not hold an administrative or coaching position in the athletics department. Duties of the faculty athletics representative shall be determined by the member institution.
- The faculty athletics representative is recognized as the representative of the institution and its faculty in the relationship between the NCAA and the local campus. [Constitution 4.02.2]

Whereas: The NCAA Constitution requires that all member institutions designate a Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR), and

Whereas: The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA), in addressing the faculty role in campus athletics governance, noted that 'faculty must engage their academic perspective to help ensure that the institutional investment in athletics remains in the interest of the primary academic mission of the institution', and

Whereas: There is a need to clarify provisions in F05-2, therefore be it

Resolved: That F05-2 be replaced by this policy, and be it further

Resolved: That the attached policy be adopted and implemented as soon as it is approved by the President, and be it further

Resolved: That the Senate Chair, the Chief of Staff, and Athletics Board Chair review and update the FAR position as needed at least once every three years.

Rationale: Revisions are needed to clarify implementation language in the current policy. For example, existing policy states that "The term of the office shall be three years and may be renewed once with approval of the President in consultation with the Academic Senate Executive Committee." Although this seems to establish an explicit term limit, the current policy also states that "Additional years of service may be added if service on national committees result in a

significant benefit to the University.” There is a need to clarify the open-ended nature of this provision. In addition, more information, not included in F05-2, is needed with regard to the charge and responsibilities of the FAR.

Approved: 9/28/15

Vote: 8-0-0

Present: Grosvenor, Mathur, Curry, Shifflett, Beyersdorf, Becker, Gleixner, Elmiaari

Absent: Laker

Financial Impact: None expected.

Workload Impact: No change from current situation.

## **1. Faculty Athletics Representative Charge**

To ensure the academic integrity of the athletics program, to serve as an advocate for student-athlete well-being, represent faculty perspectives on all aspects of our intercollegiate athletics program, and to play a part in maintaining institutional control of the athletics program.

Particularly important components of this charge include informing the athletics department of faculty concerns and conferring on academic/athletic matters with administrators, faculty, students and/or alumni. The FAR will also be actively engaged in the four domains identified in the NCCA FAR report: academics, compliance/rules interpretation, student-athlete well-being, and administrative responsibilities

([http://www.ncaa.org/sites/default/files/FAR\\_STUDY\\_Report\\_final.pdf](http://www.ncaa.org/sites/default/files/FAR_STUDY_Report_final.pdf); pg. 15).

## **2. Faculty Athletics Representative Responsibilities**

2.1 Take an active role in assuring the academic integrity of the athletics program and welfare of the student-athlete.

2.2 Review proposed competition schedules in order to monitor student-athlete time demands and bring concerns to the Athletics Board.

2.3 Monitor the academic performance of student athletes and teams. Report results to the President’s Chief of Staff. Work cooperatively and constructively with coaches, faculty, and students to assist student athletes in their academic pursuits.

2.4 Take an active role in assuring that appropriate academic services and university resources are available to student athletes.

2.5 Provide advice to the President that reflects the ‘values of the faculty and which is rooted in the academic ethic of the institution’ (NCAA FAR handbook).

2.6 Update the President on all matters and incidents involving compliance.

2.7 Work closely with the Athletic Director, the AVP for Student Academic Success Services, and the Athletic Student Success Services Center to review and evaluate the academic and general support services for student athletes.

2.8 Work with the AVP for Student Academic Success Services, the Athletic Student Success Services Center, faculty, and coaches to facilitate nominations for all academic awards and scholarships available through our athletic conference, the NCAA, and other organizations.

2.9 Participate in student-athlete orientation meetings and exit interviews.

- 2.10 Assess, understand, and address faculty concerns regarding student athletes and our Intercollegiate Athletics Program.
- 2.11 Assess, understand, and address student-athlete concerns regarding academic issues.
- 2.12 Participate in the investigation and reporting of possible violations of Conference, NCAA, and institutional policies and rules.
- 2.13 Facilitate adherence to eligibility requirements.
- 2.14 Meet with the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee at least twice a semester.
- 2.15 Work cooperatively with and support the work of the Associate Athletic Director for Compliance and contribute to the development of appeals, reports, and other correspondence to our Conference and the NCAA as outlined in NCAA and Conference Manuals. Faculty athletics representatives should play a central role in any major institutional inquiries into alleged or suspected rules violations. They should be involved in the preparation of written reports of infractions that are made to our conference or to the NCAA.
- 2.16 Serve as an ex officio non-voting member of the University Athletics Board.
- 2.17 Represent SJSU as a delegate to NCAA Conventions and Conference meetings. Work cooperatively with the President, Athletic Director, Associate Athletic Director for Compliance, the faculty and others in developing the institution's position on proposals at NCAA Conventions and Conference meetings.
- 2.18 Annually administer the NCAA Division 1 Coaches exam.
- 2.19 Annually review the institution's Graduation Rates Report and Academic Program Rates Report for each sport.
- 2.20 Prepare an annual report for the Academic Senate with information including, but not limited to, FAR activities, academic performance statistics, including graduation rates, for student-athletes, academic services for student-athletes, compliance/rules concerns, and responses to faculty concerns related to our intercollegiate athletics program.
- 2.21 Be a knowledgeable resource for the campus community with respect to NCAA and conference rules.
- 2.22 Play an active role "in the preparation of the institution's NCAA self-study report in each of the four basic areas, and play a leading role in the areas of academic integrity, governance and commitment to rules compliance, and commitment to equity, which includes student-athlete welfare." [FARA Handbook]
- 2.23 Work closely with the FAR-elect to prepare that person to effectively transition into their FAR role.
- 2.24 Fulfill any additional duties assigned by the President.

### **3. Recruitment and Appointment of the Faculty Athletics Representative**

- 3.1 The Senate Chair, Chair of the Athletics Board and the President's Chief of Staff are responsible for establishing, regularly reviewing, and updating as needed, the position description for the FAR.
- 3.2 The FAR will serve a 3-year term renewable for only one additional 3-year term. In extraordinary circumstances the term could be extended for 1 year by the President. An example of a situation when an extension might be appropriate would be where an NCAA investigation begins during the FAR's last semester but extends into the following year. Recruitment of

applicants to serve as the Faculty Athletics Representative will be done through the normal Committee on Committee's process. All full time tenured faculty interested in the FAR position will be required to submit a 1-page application detailing their experiences and qualifications to serve as SJSU's FAR. All applications will be forwarded to the Executive Committee of the Senate and the Athletics Board for review. In review of applicants considerations should include (a) the candidate must be a tenured full professor, (b) the candidate should have prior successful faculty leadership experience, unrelated to intercollegiate athletics, (c) there should be no conflict of interest, and (d) the candidate should have experiences and skills likely to enhance their effectiveness as SJSU's FAR.

Each group will forward its recommendations to the President's Chief of Staff who will arrange for the individuals nominated to be interviewed by the Chair of the Academic Senate, Chair of the Athletics Board, and the Chief of Staff. The President shall make the appointment from the finalists that result from the interview process.

#### 3.2.1 Reappointment of a FAR. Reappointment should not be automatic.

Reappointment for one three-year term would be appropriate in cases where performance has been exceptional and/or service on national committees would result in a significant benefit to the University. At the conclusion of the second year of an initial 3-year term, the President would consult with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and Athletics Board regarding the possible re-appointment of an incumbent FAR and have the Chief of Staff initiate and complete a review of the performance of the FAR in sufficient time to identify a FAR-elect if the incumbent is not re-appointed. Review of the performance of the FAR includes a review by the faculty members of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, with input solicited from other members of the Senate.

Absent consideration or approval for reappointment a search for a FAR-elect will commence on a timeline that permits the appointment of a FAR-elect in the last semester of a FAR's term.

3.2.2 Interim appointments. When a FAR will be unable to serve for just one semester (e.g., sabbatical) an interim appointment can be made by the President in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. If a FAR will be unable to serve for a year or more, recruitment of a new FAR will be needed.

### **4. Recruitment and appointment of the FAR-elect.**

At the start of the last year of a FAR's term, the Committee on Committees chair shall put out a call for applicants to serve as FAR-elect in the final semester of the FAR's term and subsequently assume the FAR role. The selection and appointment process followed is that noted above in section 3.2.

4.1 FAR-elect responsibilities. Confer and work with the outgoing FAR the semester before assuming their role as FAR. To facilitate a smooth transition, efforts should be directed toward gaining a solid understanding of and ability to assume their FAR responsibilities.

4.2 FAR-elect term. A FAR-elect serves for one semester as FAR-elect followed by a 3-year term as SJSU's FAR.

Resources used in development of this policy:

- NCAA FARA Handbook: <http://farawebsite.org/what-is-an-far/fara-handbook/>
- FAR Association Website: <http://farawebsite.org/welcome-to-farawebsite-org/about-fara/about-fars/>
- COIA Report: Campus Athletics Governance: The Faculty Role (2004): <http://sites.comm.psu.edu/thecoia/wp-content/uploads/sites/6/2014/07/Campus-Athletics-Governance-2004.pdf>



## Academic Affairs Division Budget Briefing – October 5, 2015

Marna Genes, AVP for Academic Budgets & Planning

I am pleased to provide this report on the Academic Affairs Division 2015-16 budget. My presentation will be limited to the base Operating Fund budget, which is where the significant budget changes occurred.

The division's base budget increased 8% over last year, mostly due to compensation adjustments and funding for enrollment increases.

### Academic Affairs Division Base Operating Fund Budget Changes

College	2014-15 Base Budget	Compensation Adjustments	2015-16 Enrollment Funding	Other Adjustments	2015-16 Base Budget
Applied Sciences & Arts	\$ 16,572,956	\$ 610,663	\$ -	\$ 44,521	\$ 17,228,140
Lucas College of Business	10,776,959	388,974	464,508	352,425	11,982,866
Lurie College of Education	7,903,079	225,369	403,570	-	8,532,018
Davidson College of Engineering	14,004,033	337,459	1,700,014	-	16,041,506
Humanities & Arts	18,700,057	774,052	-	-	19,474,109
Science	19,148,385	610,418	216,125	50,000	20,024,928
Social Sciences	13,945,039	480,529	51,490	-	14,477,058
Academic Support Units	12,942,772	436,759	413,685	690,328	14,483,544
Division (annual allocations)	1,969,559	394,458	770,078	(286,445)	2,847,650
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$ 115,962,839</b>	<b>\$ 4,258,681</b>	<b>\$ 4,019,470</b>	<b>\$ 850,829</b>	<b>\$ 125,091,819</b>

### Overview of New Base Funds

*Compensation Adjustments.* The \$4.3M compensation adjustments shown above include actions that took effect in 2014-15 (\$3.2M) and 2015-16 (\$1.0M). The first phase of campus-based faculty equity adjustments took effect July 1, 2015 and totaled ~\$600k.

*Enrollment Funding.* The university's enrollment plan increased by 841 full-time equivalent students (FTES) this year. 726 FTES are considered "base" or ongoing for budgeting purposes (as a conservative measure), and we refer to them as "Target" FTES. The division receives \$5,100 for each new Target FTES to fund all costs associated with enrollment growth (i.e., instruction and academic support services).

The 726 Target FTES increase resulted in a \$4.0M allocation to the division. The \$4.0M includes \$403k for the new EdD Program, which is in its second year. Full funding will be reached next year, when the program plans to have 45-50 students (3 cohorts).

Enrollment-based funds were distributed as follows: \$2.8M (71%) to the colleges per the Budget Model and for the EdD Program, \$414k (10%) went to academic support units, and \$770k went to the division account (19%). The \$770k deposited in the division account retired a ~\$500k deficit created last year when the division funded the new Budget Model, and \$286k was subsequently allocated to Academic Support Units (these are described in the following Other Adjustments section).

## New Target FTES and Funding by Residency

College	New Target FTES			7/1/2015 Base Adjustments		
	Resident	Non-resident	Total	Resident	Non-resident	Total
Applied Sciences & Arts	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lucas College of Business	123	15	138	\$ 414,018	\$ 50,490	\$ 464,508
Lurie College of Education	-	-	-	403,570	-	403,570
Davidson College of Engineering	65	417	482	229,255	1,470,759	1,700,014
Humanities & Arts	-	-	-	-	-	-
Science	18	47	65	59,850	156,275	216,125
Social Sciences	15	4	19	40,650	10,840	51,490
Graduate & Undergrad Programs	32	(10)	22	-	-	-
<b>Totals</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>473</b>	<b>726</b>	<b>\$ 1,147,343</b>	<b>\$ 1,688,364</b>	<b>\$ 2,835,707</b>

Please refer to the enclosed document that details 2015-16 resource allocations to the colleges. The document includes a full explanation of the basis for college enrollment (and other) funding, as well as the method used to determine college FTES allocations (ICLM).

*Other Adjustments.* The Provost may make adjustments to college budgets when funding levels are at odds with division goals. This year, he allocated \$352,425 in base funding to the Lucas College of Business (LCOB) to support faculty hiring. When the Budget Model was adopted, LCOB's base faculty budget decreased nearly 7% on a per FTES basis while budgets for all other colleges increased by at least 1%.

The \$44k adjustment to CASA's budget was a pass-through allocation from the university to fund rental charges paid by Kinesiology for courses that use the Sports Center (a student-fee funded building). The \$50k for Science was a fund swap for CERF funds to clear a compliance issue; this was not a net increase to Science's budget.

Academic Support Unit budgets increased by \$1.16M, with most of those resources coming from the university or other sources outside the division. The breakdown is as follows:

Unit / Program	Amount	Source
GUP / CommUniverCity Support	\$ 132,160	University
GUP / Admissions to Graduation (A to G)	218,200	University
SASS / Admissions to Graduation (A to G)	64,200	University
CIES / International Student Services	229,004	University
CIES / SEVIS Records Coordinator Position Transfer	46,764	Student Affairs
LIBR / Subscriptions Support	188,000	Academic Affairs
PRVST / Communications Support	57,407	Academic Affairs
Other Compensation Adjustments & CSUOF / CERF Realignment	168,278	Academic Affairs
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,161,420</b>	

## Review of the Induced Course Load Matrix Model (ICLM) after the First Year

The division adopted a predictive analytics method to determine the distribution of FTES to the colleges last year. The Induced Course Load Matrix (ICLM) model uses three years of historical course-taking

behavior to predict the course enrollment patterns of the current student body. There is a document here that explains ICLM in detail: [http://www.sjsu.edu/provost/budget/enrollment\\_management/](http://www.sjsu.edu/provost/budget/enrollment_management/).

The table below shows the percent of FTES achieved by college and by residency in 2014-15. Note that these are Goal FTES, which includes Target FTES (base budgeted) plus any additional FTES that are planned.

Percent of 2014-15 FTES Goal Achieved by College and Residency

College	Resident	Non-resident	Total
Applied Sciences & Arts	97.8%	89.7%	97.5%
Lucas College of Business	103.5%	105.6%	103.7%
Lurie College of Education	98.3%	79.7%	97.8%
Davidson College of Engineering	100.0%	156.1%	117.0%
Humanities & Arts	99.0%	102.5%	99.1%
Science	101.1%	133.7%	102.9%
Social Sciences	99.3%	108.8%	99.7%
Other	89.5%	103.3%	91.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>99.7%</b>	<b>131.2%</b>	<b>102.2%</b>

The results were good. Resident student FTES levels are controlled by the Chancellor's Office, and reaching 99.7% of our Goal in total was a near-perfect ending to the year. The university has been increasing non-resident enrollment in the past few years and results were strong last year, exceeding the Goal by more than 30%. It is important to note that non-resident enrollment does not impact our resident enrollment levels.

At the college level, +/- one percent is a reasonable range for enrollment results. In the case of resident students, most colleges were within this range. In cases that fall outside the range, the Office of the Provost works with the college to identify and resolve issues. For example, CASA did not meet enrollment Goals last year and has revised their admissions plan for fall 2016 accordingly. Per the Budget Model, college budgets were not adjusted downward during the year where enrollment goals were not met, but upward adjustments were made where the total FTES Goal was exceeded to the extent it was due to non-resident enrollment. Because resident enrollment levels are managed by the Chancellor's Office, colleges that exceed resident enrollment Goals put the university's overall enrollment plan at risk and are therefore not rewarded.

Overall, the ICLM model appears to be working well and it has been used again in 2015-16 for FTES allocations to the colleges. However, because ICLM is based on historical course-taking behavior, the Office of the Provost works closely with colleges to make adjustments for curricular changes that are not currently reflected in ICLM.

### SSETF Course Support Funds

Beginning with academic year 2015-16, SSETF Course Support funds were decentralized to the division, meaning the division is now authorized to allocate SSETF Course Support funds per its own practices. When SJSU implemented the SSETF in Fall 2012, Miscellaneous Course Fees were subsumed. Base (ongoing) budget allocations were made to the colleges that had Miscellaneous Course Fees in effect at the time. 2011-12 enrollment levels were used to determine funding levels by college. Both the Senate

and the Council of Chairs and Directors passed resolutions that specifically addressed a desire to adjust these allocations each year to reflect enrollment changes and to provide inflationary increases. At the same time, there was a desire to provide the colleges with flexibility to determine the best use of these resources across their curricula. Between 2012-13 and 2014-15, no adjustments were made to the legacy base budget for Miscellaneous Course Fees. Some new allocations were made, but the base remained unchanged. With the division's new authority, an allocation method was developed that intends to balance flexibility with the desire to adjust these funds each year for changing enrollment levels and for inflation.

The following table shows the result of these adjustments by college. The enrollment adjustment is essentially a catch-up adjustment for enrollment changes since 2011-12. Going forward, enrollment-based adjustments should be more moderate. Inflation adjustments will follow the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI) adjustments made to all SSETF funds. College deans have the authority to determine the allocation of SSETF-Course Support funds to their departments. **The use of these funds is limited to activities that support direct instruction.**

College	SSETF Course Support Budgets		
	2014/15	2015/16	Net Change
Applied Sciences & Arts	\$ 232,568	\$ 228,635	\$ (3,933)
Lucas College of Business	491,552	591,035	99,483
Lurie College of Education	3,095	2,839	(256)
Davidson College of Engineering	161,203	272,190	110,987
Humanities & Arts	508,102	511,597	3,495
Science	345,724	382,364	36,640
Social Sciences	5,535	5,968	433
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,747,779</b>	<b>\$ 1,994,628</b>	<b>\$ 246,849</b>

Each year, there might also be additional funds available resulting from surplus enrollments and lapsing funds. These funds will be used for instructional equipment replacement, and/or large equipment maintenance and repair costs.

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to answering your questions at the meeting on Monday.

August 6, 2015

**Colleges**

Applied Sciences and Arts  
Lucas College and Graduate School of Business  
Connie L. Lurie College of Education  
Charles W. Davidson College of Engineering  
International and Extended Studies  
Science  
Social Sciences

**Offices**

Academic Planning and Budgets  
Academic Technology  
Faculty Affairs  
Graduate and Undergraduate Programs  
Research  
Student Academic Success Services  
University Library  
University Research Foundation

To: Elaine Chin, Dean-College of Education  
Andrew Hsu, Dean-College of Engineering  
Walter Jacobs, Dean-College of Social Sciences  
Michael Parrish, Dean-College of Science  
Mary Schutten, Dean-College of Applied Science & Arts  
David Steele, Dean-College of Business  
Lisa Vollendorf, Dean-College of Humanities & the Arts

From: Andrew Hale Feinstein   
Provost and Vice President, Academic Affairs

Re: 2015-16 College Resource Allocations

I am pleased to provide you with the details of 2015-16 resource allocations to the academic colleges.

**Introduction**

The overall budget situation for the campus and the division continues to improve. The final state budget funded 3% enrollment growth for the CSU, which resulted in an increase of 453 resident FTES for SJSU (a 2.1% increase). The additional FTES received by SJSU and their associated resources will promote our efforts to provide access, and improve graduation and retention rates by making it possible to fund more sections.

Improving tenure-density remains a high priority, and I was pleased to approve 68 faculty recruitments this year. With 57 new faculty arriving this Fall, we are moving in the right direction and at a good pace. This is the largest cohort of incoming faculty in at least seven years, and two years of this level of growth is unprecedented. Tenure density in Fall 2014 was just under 53%, and it is projected to improve almost 2% in Fall 2015. This is the first reversal since Fall 2009 when tenure density was 60%. Fall 2016 should see a significant improvement as well.

The university decentralized SSETF-Course Support funds this year. This SSETF fee subsumed Miscellaneous Course Fees in Fall 2012. I am now authorized to allocate and manage these funds locally. The basis for 2015-16 allocations followed consultation with the Council of Deans and is detailed in Section 2

Before presenting Operating Fund and SSETF Course Support allocations, I would like to first opine on the new Budget Model that was adopted last year.

### The Budget Model and the Marginal Cost of Instruction

As you recall, I engaged a consultant to develop a Budget Model that would provide stability and predictability. I appreciate the feedback I received during the year. The general consensus is that the stability and predictability it provides are its strengths. While the overall response to the new Budget Model has been very positive, I have also heard concerns about the basis for the Marginal Cost of Instruction used to allocate resources for incremental enrollment changes. The concerns are mainly that it is based on a year when budget reductions occurred, and that it “locks in” a Marginal Cost of Instruction that is at odds with our improvement goals. In response, I would like to clarify the way in which the Budget Model supports changes in the actual cost of instruction. Most importantly, I hope to impart how the model supports increases in the cost of instruction that are caused by improvements in tenure density and faculty salaries, both of which are captured in the Marginal Cost of Instruction. The box below shows the calculations for the Marginal Cost of Instruction.

Marginal Cost of Instruction			
<i>(T/TT = Tenured/Tenure-track faculty)</i>			
<b>Step 1: Calculate the Total Cost of Instruction for each college:</b>			
T/TT Average Salary x T/TT Instructional FTEF	=	T/TT Cost of Instruction	
Temp Average Salary x Temp Instructional FTEF	=	Temp Cost of Instruction	
Other Average Salary x Other Instructional FTEF	=	<u>Other Cost of Instruction</u>	
		<b>Total Cost of Instruction</b>	
<b>Step 2: Total Cost of Instruction ÷ FTES = Marginal Cost of Instruction</b>			

The Budget Model was originally developed using 2012-13 instructional cost data. The Marginal Cost of Instruction rates developed at that time were used to determine college budgets last year, resulting in a \$10.8 million investment in instruction<sup>1</sup>. Per the Budget Model, the Marginal Cost of Instruction would be recalculated each year and used for the next round of allocations. However, in 2013-14, the basis for deriving instructional FTEF changed, removing categories of assigned time that were less related to direct instruction. This reduced the Marginal Cost of Instruction for every college. 2014-15 data show a further decrease in most cases, which is likely the result of continued declines in tenure density (it dropped from 54% to 53% between Fall 2013 and Fall 2014). Table 1 compares the Marginal Cost of Instruction between 2012-13 and 2014-15.

**Table 1 – Marginal Cost of Instruction**

	CASA	BUS	EDUC	ENGR	H&A	SCI	COSS
2012-13	\$ 3,657	\$ 3,366	\$ 3,489	\$ 3,527	\$ 3,157	\$ 3,325	\$ 2,710
2013-14	\$ 3,000	\$ 2,451	\$ 3,082	\$ 2,721	\$ 2,801	\$ 2,746	\$ 2,431
2014-15	\$ 3,058	\$ 2,237	\$ 3,029	\$ 2,333	\$ 2,766	\$ 2,463	\$ 2,278

<sup>1</sup> The \$10.8M was sourced as follows: \$3.8M for enrollment growth; \$7M to fund the Budget Model, with \$4.2M from the university and \$2.8M from the division.

Given the impact of changing the basis for instructional FTEF, the Marginal Cost of Instruction will remain at 2012-13 rates until a college exceeds that rate. At that time, the new higher rate will be used. It will take some time for the Marginal Cost of Instruction to reach 2012-13 levels. Even with the large numbers of new faculty planned for the next few years, their impact will not be fully reflected in the Marginal Cost of Instruction until they are teaching full course assignments. Moving forward, my office will provide a projected Marginal Cost of Instruction for each college when faculty recruitment requests are made to determine their affordability, for both the colleges and the division in whole. In the meantime, if a college is carrying out instruction at a lower cost than provided by the 2012-13 rates, the effect accrues to the college. With that said, the goal is to increase tenured/tenure-track faculty in the classroom, and to contain activities that compete with this goal. The Budget Model supports this.

*Strategic Considerations:*

- Increases in tenure density in the classroom will increase the Marginal Cost of Instruction
- Increases in faculty salaries, as seen with recent compensation programs, will increase the Marginal Cost of Instruction
- Increases in assigned time unrelated to direct teaching (e.g., additional advising and committee assignments) will reduce the Marginal Cost of Instruction
- Colleges that can teach using a less costly model than the 2012-13 rates are doing so by maintaining a tenure density that is lower than in 2012-13.

My hope is that you will use this information to guide your decisions about investments in tenure-track hires and allocations of assigned time.

## SECTION 1 – OPERATING FUND ALLOCATIONS

College base budgets increased by \$5.5 million, or 5.5% since July 1, 2014. Most of the increase is due to compensation adjustments (\$2.6M) and enrollment funding (\$2.4M).

**Table 2 – College Base Operating Fund Budgets**

College	2014-15 Base Budget	2014-15 Compensation Adjustments	2015-16 Enrollment Funding	Other Adjustments	2015-16 Base Budget
Applied Sciences & Arts	\$ 16,572,956	\$ 497,377	\$ -	\$ 44,521	\$ 17,114,854
Lucas College of Business	10,776,959	221,957	464,508	352,425	11,815,849
Lurie College of Education	7,903,079	190,719	-	-	8,093,798
Davidson College of Engineering	14,004,033	246,166	1,700,014	-	15,950,213
Humanities & Arts	18,700,057	606,842	-	-	19,306,899
Science	19,148,385	468,393	216,125	50,000	19,882,903
Social Sciences	13,945,039	415,490	51,490	-	14,412,019
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$ 101,050,508</b>	<b>\$ 2,646,944</b>	<b>\$ 2,432,137</b>	<b>\$ 446,946</b>	<b>\$ 106,576,535</b>

### Compensation Adjustments

The 2014-15 CSU compensation program included General Service Increases and equity increases. In addition to the increases that applied to all CSU employees, SJSU also provided a campus-based equity plan. Details of the faculty equity plan, which took effect on July 1, 2015, were distributed in April and



can be found on the Provost's website. Details of the staff equity plan should be announced soon. The \$2.6 million for compensation adjustments shown in Table 2 reflects 2014-15 adjustments only. The details of the 2015-16 campus-based equity adjustments are currently being compiled and will be included in the final Academic Affairs Division Budget Plan document, which is published in the fall.

### **FTES Allocations and Enrollment Funding**

The 2015-16 enrollment plan includes 3% growth in resident FTES, and nearly 40% growth in non-resident FTES.

The Chancellor's Office assigns resident enrollment Targets to each campus. This year's Target of 22,201 FTES increased by 453 FTES over last year (2.1%). Per CSU policy, resident enrollments should fall between 99% and 103.5% of the Target assigned by the Chancellor's Office, and the 2015-16 enrollment plan for 22,908 resident FTES will place us safely within that range (103.2%).

Presidents have the authority to establish the Target for non-resident students. I have a plan to grow non-resident enrollments to 15% of total FTES by 2021; we are currently at about 10%. The 2015-16 enrollment plan includes 40% growth in non-resident FTES. It is important to note that our non-resident enrollment growth did not impact our resident enrollment. Final non-resident enrollments totaled 2,532 FTES last year, far surpassing the target of 1,927 FTES. Table 3 shows the 2015-16 total enrollment plan.

**Table 3 – Total SJSU 2015-16 Enrollment Plan (FTES)**

<b>Resident Status</b>	<b>2015-16 Plan</b>	<b>2014-15 Plan</b>	<b>Change</b>
<b>Resident FTES</b>	22,908	22,835	3.2%
<b>Non-resident FTES</b>	2,695	1,927	39.8%
<b>Total FTES</b>	<b>25,603</b>	<b>24,762</b>	<b>3.4%</b>

These 25,603 FTES are distributed across the colleges using the Induced Course Load Matrix (ICLM) model, which predicts enrollments for each college based on historical course-taking patterns. For details about the ICLM, please go to: [http://www.sjsu.edu/provost/docs/ICLM\\_Explained\\_2014-15.pdf](http://www.sjsu.edu/provost/docs/ICLM_Explained_2014-15.pdf). The "Other" category shown below includes courses (mainly UNVS courses) administered by Graduate and Undergraduate Programs (GUP). The funding for these courses is provided to GUP via a separate mechanism. Table 4 shows the distribution of FTES to the colleges and compares it to last year.

**Table 4 – 2015-16 College FTES Distribution**

<b>College</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>Change</b>
Applied Sciences & Arts	3,801	3,841	(40)
Lucas College of Business	2,955	2,758	197
Lurie College of Education	1,389	1,407	(18)
Davidson College of Engineering	3,634	3,002	632
Humanities & Arts	4,768	4,816	(48)
Science	4,293	4,156	137
Social Sciences	4,703	4,712	(9)
Other	60	70	(10)
<b>Totals</b>	<b>25,603</b>	<b>24,762</b>	<b>841</b>



The University's budgeted enrollment plan includes both "Target" FTES, and "Goal" FTES. Target FTES are tied to the division's base funding. Goal FTES drive one-time funds each year. The 841 net FTES increase shown in Table 4 is made up of 726 Target FTES and 115 Goal FTES. Their distribution is shown below in Table 5.

**Table 5 – 2015-16 Incremental Target and Goal FTES Adjustments**

College	Target	Goal	Total
Applied Sciences & Arts	-	(40)	(40)
Lucas College of Business	138	59	197
Lurie College of Education	-	(18)	(18)
Davidson College of Engineering	482	150	632
Humanities & Arts	-	(48)	(48)
Science	65	72	137
Social Sciences	19	(28)	(9)
Other	22	(32)	(10)
<b>Totals</b>	<b>726</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>841</b>

College budgets are adjusted annually for these changes in FTES. Per the Budget Model adopted last year, adjustments for Target FTES are made based on the Marginal Cost of Instruction. The Marginal Cost of Instruction is discussed fully later in this document. Table 6 shows the distribution of new Target FTES and associated base funding.

**Table 6 – New Target FTES and Base Funding**

College	New Target FTES			Marginal Cost of Instruction	7/1/2015 Base Adjustments		
	Resident	Non- resident	Total		Resident	Non-resident	Total
Applied Sciences & Arts	-	-	-	\$ 3,657	-	-	-
Lucas College of Business	123	15	138	3,366	\$ 414,018	\$ 50,490	\$ 464,508
Lurie College of Education	-	-	-	3,489	-	-	-
Davidson College of Engineering	65	417	482	3,527	229,255	1,470,759	1,700,014
Humanities & Arts	-	-	-	3,157	-	-	-
Science	18	47	65	3,325	59,850	156,275	216,125
Social Sciences	15	4	19	2,710	40,650	10,840	51,490
Other	32	(10)	22	-	-	-	-
<b>Totals</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>473</b>	<b>726</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$ 743,773</b>	<b>\$ 1,688,364</b>	<b>\$ 2,432,137</b>

Goal FTES are funded based on residency. Resident Goal FTES are funded at \$2,600 each, and Non-resident Goal FTES are funded per the Marginal Cost of Instruction. Table 7 shows the changes in resident and non-resident Goal FTES over last year and associated one-time funding adjustments. Please refer to Attachment 1 for further details about the enrollment plan and associated resources.

**Table 7 – Changes to Goal FTES and Funding**

<b>College</b>	<b>Goal FTES Changes</b>			<b>One-time Adjustments</b>		
	<b>Resident*</b>	<b>Non-resident</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2600/ Resident</b>	<b>Marginal Cost</b>	<b>Total One-time</b>
Applied Sciences & Arts	(56)	16	(40)	\$ (145,600)	\$ 58,512	\$ (87,088)
Lucas College of Business	30	29	59	78,000	97,614	175,614
Lurie College of Education	(23)	5	(18)	(59,800)	17,445	(42,355)
Davidson College of Engineering	(22)	172	150	(57,200)	606,644	549,444
Humanities & Arts	(68)	20	(48)	(176,800)	63,140	(113,660)
Science	36	36	72	93,600	119,700	213,300
Social Sciences	(51)	23	(28)	(132,600)	62,330	(70,270)
Other	(26)	(6)	(32)	-	-	-
<b>Totals</b>	<b>(180)</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>\$ (400,400)</b>	<b>\$ 1,025,385</b>	<b>\$ 624,985</b>

Resident Goal FTES decreased this year by 180 in order to comply with the CSU mandate to stay within 99%-103.5% of the Target established by the Chancellor. In recent years, SJSU has enrolled upwards of 106% of the resident Target. Last year's resident enrollment ended at 104.8% of the Target. As noted earlier in this document, the 2015-16 enrollment plan results in about 103.2% of Target.

As with last year, there will be no downward adjustment to 2015-16 resources if a college falls short of their Total FTES. When a college exceeds their Total FTES, additional funds will only be provided when the excess was due to non-resident enrollment.

### **Other Adjustments**

Each year, I may make adjustments to college budgets when funding levels are at odds with division goals. This year, I have allocated \$352,425 in base funding to the Lucas College of Business (LCOB) to support faculty hiring. When the Budget Model was adopted, LCOB's base faculty budget decreased nearly 7% on a per FTES basis while budgets for all other colleges increased by at least 1%.

I have provided additional FTES to the College of Applied Sciences & Arts to allow Dean Schutten time to evaluate the issues around recent enrollment declines. ICLM determined 3,643 FTES for CASA, and I have allocated 3,801 FTES with associated resources. These were included in the Final FTES allocations sent to you on May 15<sup>th</sup> by AVP Genes.

After the May 15<sup>th</sup> "Final" FTES allocations were sent, the Chancellor's Office increased SJSU's resident FTES Target by 200. I subsequently secured 160 additional resident Goal FTES to address enrollment demand in LCOB (80 FTES) and to expand sections in Science (80 FTES) to support graduation rate improvements. One-time funding at \$2,600 was provided to those colleges for these additional FTES, and they are included in Table 7 and Attachment 1.

Two other adjustments were made to college budgets for 2015-16. CASA received \$44,521 in base funding from the University for facility rental charges paid to the Student Union (Kinesiology program). This allocation has been made on an annual basis for many years, and it was finally decided to put the funding in CASA's budget. The College of Science received \$50,000 in replacement of division CERF (Continuing Education Revenue Fund) funding for Moss Landing. The transaction was merely a fund swap, not an increase in funding, and was necessitated to comply with CERF policy.

## Faculty Searches

A total of 68 faculty searches were approved for 2015-16, including 9 continuing searches from last year. We will welcome 57 new faculty in Fall 2015 as a result of last year's searches. Table 8 summarizes the searches by college. Attachment 2 provides a full list of the searches by discipline.

**Table 8 – 2015-16 Faculty Searches**

Unit	New Searches	Continuing Searches	Total
Applies Sciences & Arts	15	2	17
Business	8		8
Education	5	1	6
Engineering	3	1	4
Humanities & the Arts	5	2	7
Science	13	2	15
Social Sciences	7	1	8
University Library	3		3
Total	59	9	68

## Division Wide Allocations

Under the new Budget Model, very little funding is held by the division. Colleges are expected to meet all requirements within existing resources. Division funding for full-time one-semester sabbaticals will continue to be allocated, along with RSCA funds.

## SECTION 2 – STUDENT SUCCESS, EXCELLENCE & TECHNOLOGY FEE (SSETF) – COURSE SUPPORT ALLOCATIONS

Beginning with academic year 2015-16, Academic Affairs will receive SSETF Course Support funds separate from the request-based process used for Instructionally Related Activities and Student Success funds. Requests for those funds will continue to be managed centrally and subject to review by the Campus Fee Advisory Committee (CFAC). The University has issued a biennial call for requests, which are due to the Provost's Office on September 15<sup>th</sup>.

The division is now authorized to allocate SSETF Course Support funds per its own practices. When SJSU implemented the SSETF in Fall 2012, Miscellaneous Course Fees were subsumed. Base (ongoing) budget allocations were made to the colleges that had Miscellaneous Course Fees in effect at the time. 2011-12 enrollment levels were used to determine funding levels by college. Both the Senate and the Council of Chairs and Directors passed resolutions that specifically addressed a desire to adjust these allocations each year to reflect enrollment changes and to provide inflationary increases. At the same time, there was a desire to provide the colleges with flexibility to determine the best use of these resources across their curricula. Between 2012-13 and 2014-15, no adjustments were made to the legacy base budget for Miscellaneous Course Fees. Some new allocations were made, but the base remained unchanged. With

the division's new authority, an allocation method was developed that intends to balance flexibility with the desire to adjust these funds each year for changing enrollment levels and for inflation<sup>2</sup>.

Attachment 3 shows the result of these adjustments. The enrollment adjustment is essentially a catch-up adjustment for enrollment changes since 2011-12. Going forward, enrollment-based adjustments should be more moderate. Enrollment-based allocations are based on both Target and Goal FTES, so there are both base (Target) and one-time (Goal) budget adjustments. College deans have the authority to determine the allocation of SSETF-Course Support funds to their departments. **The use of these funds is limited to activities that support direct instruction.** In order to demonstrate accountability to the Campus Fee Advisory Committee and to the student body, colleges are asked to submit their final allocation plans to the Academic Planning & Budgets Office (APB) by **October 30<sup>th</sup>**. APB will forward a reporting template to the College Finance Liaison Group (FLG) in September. College allocations will be published on the APB website.

Each year, there might also be additional funds available resulting from surplus enrollments and lapsing funds. In 2015-16, the division will use these funds to replace and repair instructional equipment in the College of Science. The lists of top-priority needs you submitted made it clear we are only addressing the tip of the iceberg, and I plan to chip away at the list as we move forward.

Please feel free to contact Marna Genes if you have any questions.

Attachments:

1. 2015-16 Goal FTES, Target FTES and Budget Adjustments
2. 2015-16 Approved Faculty Searches
3. SSETF Course Support Adjustment for 2015-16

Cc: Academic Affairs Leadership Team  
President's Cabinet  
Senate Executive Committee  
University Council of Chairs & Directors  
Finance Liaison Group

---

<sup>2</sup> The University uses the Higher Education Price Index to adjust the SSETF for inflation each year. The 2015-16 adjustment was 3%.

**2015-16 Target & Goal FTES, and Budget Adjustments**  
**SJSU Provost's Office - August 3, 2015**

**REVISED WITH 160 ADDITIONAL GOAL FTES**

	2015-16 GOAL FTES												Final CY 2014-15 FTES				
	Summer 2015			Fall 2015			Spring 2016			CY 2015-16							
	CA Res	Non-Res	Total	CA Res	Non-Res	Total	CA Res	Non-Res	Total	CA Res	Non-Res	Total	CA Res	Non-Res	Total	Change	
CASA	-	-	-	3,795	145	3,940	3,530	130	3,660	3,663	138	3,801	3,647	111	3,758	43	
Business	20	2	22	2,783	275	3,058	2,574	255	2,829	2,689	266	2,955	2,625	235	2,860	95	
Education	100	-	100	1,344	45	1,389	1,254	35	1,289	1,349	40	1,389	1,346	27	1,373	16	
Engineering	-	-	-	2,230	1,690	3,920	2,041	1,305	3,346	2,136	1,498	3,634	2,092	1,420	3,512	122	
H&A	-	-	-	4,719	270	4,989	4,331	215	4,546	4,525	243	4,768	4,550	229	4,779	(11)	
Science	-	-	-	4,197	365	4,562	3,763	260	4,023	3,980	313	4,293	3,990	308	4,298	(5)	
Soc Sci	-	-	-	4,799	225	5,024	4,200	180	4,380	4,500	203	4,703	4,494	191	4,685	18	
Others	-	-	-	59	(6)	53	73	(6)	67	66	(6)	60	44	11	55	5	
Total	120	2	122	23,926	3,009	26,935	21,766	2,374	24,140	22,908	2,695	25,603	22,788	2,532	25,320	283	
103.2%										104.8%							

	2015-16 TARGET FTES									Marginal Cost of Instruction	7/1/2015 Base Adjustment		
	CY 2015-16 Budget			CY 2014-15 Budget			CHANGE				CA Res	Non-Res	Total
	CA Res	Non-Res	Total	CA Res	Non-Res	Total	CA Res	Non-Res	Total				
CASA	3,542	122	3,664	3,542	122	3,664	-	-	-	\$ 3,657	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Business	2,538	237	2,775	2,415	222	2,637	123	15	138	3,366	414,018	50,490	464,508
Education	1,307	35	1,342	1,307	35	1,342	-	-	-	3,489	-	-	-
Engineering	2,058	1,326	3,384	1,993	909	2,902	65	417	482	3,527	229,255	1,470,759	1,700,014
H&A	4,374	223	4,597	4,374	223	4,597	-	-	-	3,157	-	-	-
Science	3,757	277	4,034	3,739	230	3,969	18	47	65	3,325	59,850	156,275	216,125
Soc Sci	4,335	180	4,515	4,320	176	4,496	15	4	19	2,710	40,650	10,840	51,490
Others	90	-	90	58	10	68	32	(10)	22	-	-	-	-
Total	22,001	2,400	24,401	21,748	1,927	23,675	253	473	726		\$ 743,773	\$ 1,688,364	\$ 2,432,137

	GOAL minus TARGET FTES (surplus)			ONE-TIME FUNDS			COMPARISON	
	CY 2015-16 Budget			\$2600/ Resident	Non-res @ College Rate	Total One-time	Last Year One-time \$\$	One-time \$\$ Difference
	CA Res	Non-Res	Total					
CASA	121	16	137	\$ 314,600	\$ 58,512	\$ 373,112	\$ 460,200	\$ (87,088)
Business	151	29	180	392,600	97,614	490,214	314,600	175,614
Education	42	5	47	109,200	17,445	126,645	169,000	(42,355)
Engineering	78	172	250	202,800	606,644	809,444	260,000	549,444
H&A	151	20	171	392,600	63,140	455,740	569,400	(113,660)
Science	223	36	259	579,800	119,700	699,500	486,200	213,300
Soc Sci	165	23	188	429,000	62,330	491,330	561,600	(70,270)
Others	(24)	(6)	(30)	-	-	-	-	-
Total	907	295	1,202	\$ 2,420,600	\$ 1,025,385	\$ 3,445,985	\$ 2,821,000	\$ 624,985

	Net Budget Change by Residency		
	CA Res	Non-Res	Total
CASA	\$ (145,600)	\$ 58,512	\$ (87,088)
Business	492,018	148,104	640,122
Education	(59,800)	17,445	(42,355)
Engineering	172,055	2,077,403	2,249,458
H&A	(176,800)	63,140	(113,660)
Science	153,450	275,975	429,425
Soc Sci	(91,950)	73,170	(18,780)
Others	-	-	-
Total	\$ 343,373	\$ 2,713,749	\$ 3,057,122

## 2015-16 APPROVED FACULTY SEARCHES

College	Department	Discipline
ASA	Health Science & Recreation	Public Health
ASA	Health Science & Recreation	Public Health
ASA	Health Science & Recreation	Undergraduate Recreation (Continuing)
ASA	Hospitality Management	Event Planning & Management
ASA	Journalism & Mass Comm	School Director / Social Media
ASA	Journalism & Mass Comm	Public Relations
ASA	Justice Studies	Open Specialization (Research Methods & Statistics)
ASA	Justice Studies	Forensic Science
ASA	Kinesiology	Motor Development
ASA	Kinesiology	Exercise Physiology
ASA	Nursing	Care of the Adult / Medical / Surgical
ASA	Nursing	Community Health
ASA	Nutrition, Food Science & Pkg	Packaging
ASA	Nutrition, Food Science & Pkg	Food Service Management & Dietetics
ASA	Occupational Therapy	Adult Rehabilitation
ASA	Occupational Therapy	Community Based Practice / Chair (Continuing)
ASA	SLIS	Information Systems & Knowledge Structures
BUS	Accounting & Finance	Accounting /AIS /Taxation
BUS	Accounting & Finance	Accounting /AIS /Taxation
BUS	Accounting & Finance	Finance
BUS	Global Innovation & Leadership	Transportation / Logistics Management
BUS	Global Innovation & Leadership	Global Leadership
BUS	Management	Human Resources Management
BUS	Marketing & Decision Sciences	Marketing
BUS	Marketing & Decision Sciences	Business Statistics / Analytics / Data Mining
EDUC	Child & Adolescent Development	Child & Adolescent Development (Continuing)
EDUC	Child & Adolescent Development	Child & Adolescent Development
EDUC	College of Education	Open Specialization
EDUC	Communicative Disorders & Sciences	Communicative Disorders & Sciences
EDUC	Counselor Education	Counselor Education
EDUC	Teacher Education	Teacher Education
ENGR	Aviation	Flight Operations (Continuing)
ENGR	Computer Engineering	Open Specialization
ENGR	Computer Engineering	Open Specialization
ENGR	Electrical Engineering	Open Specialization
HA	English & Comparative Literature	English Education (Continuing)
HA	Linguistics & Language Development	TESOL with Technology Focus
HA	Linguistics & Language Development	Linguistics / Socio-Phonetics
HA	Music & Dance	Music Education (Continuing)
HA	Music & Dance	Modern Dance
HA	Television, Radio, Film, and Theatre	Production Design & Technology
HA	World Languages & Literatures	Spanish
SCI	Biology	Toxicologist
SCI	Biology	Cell Biologist
SCI	Biology / Science Education	Cell Biology / Science Education
SCI	Chemistry	Organic Chemistry (Continuing)
SCI	Chemistry	Inorganic Chemistry
SCI	Computer Science	Open Specialization (Continuing)
SCI	Geology	Sedimentology
SCI	Mathematics	Numerical Analysis
SCI	Mathematics	Applied Discrete Math
SCI	Mathematics	Statistics
SCI	Mathematics	Mathematics / Mathematics Education
SCI	Meteorology	Water / Drought Science
SCI	Moss Landing Marin Labs	Librarian
SCI	Physics	Experimental Optics
SCI	Physics	Computational Astrophysics
SSCI	Communication Studies	Performance Studies
SSCI	Economics	Macroeconomics & Monetary Policy
SSCI	History	Early Modern World History
SSCI	Political Science	Public Administration (Continuing)
SSCI	Political Science	American Politics, Federal, Civic Engagement
SSCI	Psychology	Clinical Psychology
SSCI	Psychology	Human Factors
SSCI	Urban and Regional Planning	Physical & Land Use Planning / Real Estate Development
LIBR	University Library	Director, Special Collections & Archives
LIBR	University Library	Liaison Librarian for Engineering
LIBR	University Library	Liaison Librarian for Business & Interdisciplinary / Entrepreneurial Programs
<b>Total</b>	<b>68</b>	

**SSETF COURSE SUPPORT ADJUSTMENT FOR 2015-16***Goal: Provide annual enrollment and HEPI adjustments, per Senate and UCCD Resolutions*

	2014/15 Base Budget	BASE COURSE SUPPORT					ONE-TIME COURSE SUPPORT			2015/16 Course Support Budget	Net Change
		2011/12 FTES [1]	2015/16 Target FTES	Enrollment Change [2]	Enrollment-Adjusted Base	Plus 3% HEPI New Base	Course Support per FTES [3]	2015/16 Goal FTES	One-time Course Support		
ASA	\$ 232,568	3,982	3,664	-8.0%	\$ 213,995	\$ 220,415	\$ 60	137	\$ 8,220	\$ 228,635	\$ (3,933)
BUS	491,552	2,463	2,775	12.7%	553,820	570,435	206	100	20,600	591,035	99,483
EDUC	3,095	1,558	1,342	-13.9%	2,665	2,745	2	47	94	2,839	(256)
ENGR	161,203	2,217	3,384	52.6%	246,060	253,440	75	250	18,750	272,190	110,987
H&A	508,102	4,877	4,597	-5.7%	478,930	493,300	107	171	18,297	511,597	3,495
SCI	345,724	3,924	4,034	2.8%	355,415	366,075	91	179	16,289	382,364	36,640
SOCSCI	5,535	4,455	4,515	1.3%	5,610	5,780	1	188	188	5,968	433
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,747,779</b>	<b>23,476</b>	<b>24,311</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>\$ 1,856,495</b>	<b>\$ 1,912,190</b>	<b>\$ 79</b>	<b>1,072</b>	<b>\$ 82,438</b>	<b>\$ 1,994,628</b>	<b>\$ 246,849</b>

## Notes:

[1] 2012/13 SSETF allocations for course support replaced miscellaneous course fees. The allocations were based on 2011/12 enrollments.

[2] Future enrollment adjustments will compare the most recent prior year instead of 2011/12; the 2015/16 adjustment is a catch up.

[3] New Base divided by 2015/16 Target FTES = Course Support per FTES