SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE
2016/2017
Agenda
October 24, 2016, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm
Engineering 285/287

I.   Call to Order and Roll Call –

II.   Approval of Minutes:
                Senate Minutes of September 26, 2016
                Senate Minutes of October 10, 2016

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

        B. From the President of the University

IV.   Executive Committee Report:
        A. Minutes of the Executive Committee –
                Executive Committee Minutes of September 12, 2016
                Executive Committee Minutes of October 3, 2016

        B. Consent Calendar –
                Consent Calendar of October 24, 2016

        C. Executive Committee Action Items –

V.   New Business:

VI.   Unfinished Business:

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

        B. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):

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

        D. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
        *AS 1632, Policy Recommendation: Amendment B to S15-6,
        Appointment of Regular Faculty Employees; Composition of Recruitment
        Committees (First Reading)*

        *AS 1633, Policy Recommendation: Adopting New SOTE and SOLATE
        Instruments (Final Reading), Time Certain: 3:00 p.m. (Presentation with
        the Chair of SERB, Dr. Emily Slusser)*

1

E. Organization and Government Committee (O&G)

AS 1626, Policy Recommendation, Modification of Bylaw 6.13: Conversion of College Seats to at-large Seats (Final Reading)

AS 1628, Policy Recommendation, Modification of Bylaw 15 Pertaining to Editorial Changes of Senate Documents (Final Reading)

AS 1621, Policy Recommendation, Departmental Voting Rights (First Reading)

AS 1635, Amendment A to University Policy S16-8, Selection and Review of Administrators (First Reading)

AS 1634, Constitutional Amendment, Modification of Senate Constitution Related to membership (First Reading)

VIII. **State of the University Announcements:**
    A. Statewide Academic Senators
    B. Provost
    C. Vice President for Administration and Finance
    D. Vice President for Student Affairs
    E. Associated Students President
    F. Vice President for University Advancement

IX. **Special Committee Reports:**

X. **Adjournment:**

Engineering 285/287
Academic Senate   **2 p.m. – 5 p.m.**

2016/2017 Academic Senate

MINUTES
September 26, 2016

I.   **The meeting was called to order at 2:02 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Forty-Eight Senators were present.**

Ex Officio:
    Present: Kimbarow, Sabalius, Van Selst, Lee , Perea
    Absent: None

Administrative Representatives:
    Present: Papazian, Feinstein, Faas, Blaylock
    Absent: Lanning

Deans:
    Present: Green, Stacks
    Absent: Jacobs, Schutten

Students:
    Present: Medrano, Caesar, Medina, Spica, Balal
    Absent: Torres-Mendoza

Alumni Representative:
    Present: Walters
    Absent: None

Emeritus Representative:
    Present: Buzanski
    Absent: None

Honorary Representative:
    Present: Lessow-Hurley
    Absent: None

General Unit Representatives:
    Present: Matoush, Kauppila Higgins
    Absent: Trousdale

CASA Representatives:
    Present: Schultz-Krohn, Lee, Shifflett, Grosvenor, Sen
    Absent: None

COB Representatives:
    Present: Reade, Rodan, Campsey
    Absent: None

EDUC Representatives:
    Present: Laker, Mathur
    Absent: None

ENGR Representatives:
    Present: Sullivan-Green, Chung, Hamedi-Hagh
    Absent: None

H&A Representatives:
    Present: Frazier, Grindstaff, Riley Ormsbee, Miller, Khan
    Absent: None

SCI Representatives:
    Present: Kaufman, White, Cargill, Boekema
    Absent: None

SOS Representatives:
    Present: Peter, Wilson, Trulio, Curry
    Absent: Hart

II.   **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–**
       The minutes of May 9, 2016 (last meeting of AY 2015-2016) were approved.
       The minutes of May 9, 2016 (first meeting of AY 2016-2017) were approved.

III.   **Communications and Questions –**
       A. From the Chair of the Senate:
       Chair Kimbarow attended the Chancellor's 2025 Graduation Initiative last week and it was very inspiring. Teams from different CSU campuses presented their best practices to improve access and increase graduation rates. Our campus team headed by Provost

Feinstein and VP of Student Affairs, Reggie Blaylock, shared the model they have worked so hard on over the last year of creating a true partnership between Academic and Student Affairs. It was an excellent presentation and was very well received. Many people in the room were impressed. AS President Peréa was there to represent our students and did an excellent job. President Peréa was one of only two students that participated in the breakout groups. The Chancellor's goal is to ensure California is the most educated state in the country.

The Chancellor's Office is undertaking revisions to the Academic Freedom and Intellectual Property policies. However, this is being done with little faculty input.

Last week was a challenging week on this campus. We lost one of our students who had a promising life ahead of him, and we saw the inability of some of our students to tell the difference between civil and uncivil discourse. We have a lot of work to do. Chair Kimbarow thanked President Papazian for her transparency with the campus during this week.

Announcements:
Senators were invited to the open house at the Student Services Center on October 6, 2016 from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m.

Senators were invited to the annual holiday party at the President's home on December 4, 2016 from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m.

Senators were reminded to save the date for the Senate Retreat on Friday, January 27, 2017 from 8:00 a.m. to 3 p.m.

B. From the President of the University –
President Papazian thanked the members of the Executive Committee and the Senate Administrator for their dedication and commitment over the summer. President Papazian also acknowledged the challenges the campus had this week. Her goal is to be as transparent as possible. President Papazian believes, "We can't hide what happens on campus. We need to use the events to learn and have conversations about the issues no matter how difficult the conversations might be. We need to have real conversations around social justice."

President Papazian was impressed with the Chancellor's commitment to reducing the achievement gap to zero. This really is a commitment to social justice President Papazian has not seen before.

President Papazian congratulated Provost Feinstein and VP Blaylock on their leadership efforts in promoting student success. However, it will take all of us working together to meet our goals.

President Papazian is committed to an inclusive civil environment and that means people need to feel they can report when they see things. President Papazian met with the Chairs

and explained what it means to have "a duty to report." A CSU Executive Order establishes our "duty to report." Everyone on campus has the duty to report if they see something.

President Papazian acknowledged the work of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee.

Question:

Senator Sabalius commented that since President Papazian has been here she had probably noticed that the Athletics Division has a budget that is larger than six out of seven of our academic colleges. Approximately two-thirds of the Athletics Division budget is not generated by the Athletics Division itself, but comes in equal parts from the general fund and from student fees and is approximately $16 million. This is in addition to what the division itself earns. Senator Sabalius has discussed this with about seven previous Presidents of the university. Each time Senator Sabalius is given the assurance that the Athletics program will be turned around and that the problems were because of a new Athletics Director, or a new Football Coach, and often the strategies to make the program viable are ridiculous. Senator Sabalius commented, "When we didn't have enough spectators an idea was floated that we should build a bigger and better stadium. When our football team was not able to achieve a winning season we moved into a higher division with stronger competitors. It has been 21 years and a turnaround has not happened and I doubt that it will ever happen."

Senator Sabalius noted that President Papazian was a "young, strong woman with an ethnic background," and said that he had been encouraged that the President would bring a fresh view of athletics to the university. However, during the President's welcoming address she talked about sports quite often and over the summer also talked about how men's track and field had been reintroduced. Senator Sabalius asked the President how she saw the role of athletics at the university, and how she could justify the cost of athletics year-after-year when this money could be better invested in student success and closing the achievement gap?

Answer:
President Papazian responded that she comes from a background that is humanistic, but that doesn't mean it is contrary to athletics. Even the old Greeks were very committed to athletics, because there is a belief that "the body and the mind both have to be strong in order for there to be real success." President Papazian understands what "the corruption of big time athletics looks like," and she commented that she does not discount those concerns.

The first question the President asks when she looks at Athletics isn't the win-loss record. It is about student success, opportunity, and education. The first question we need to ask ourselves is how are our student athletes doing as students? Are they learning and succeeding? Have we created a pathway to education that for some of these students might not otherwise be there? Have we created a more diverse population? Our student athletes are part of SJSU. The question we have to ask ourselves is does this program

represent the values of our kids? If it doesn't then that is a very important conversation to have. Then we have a decision to make as to whether we change it so it does, or we say this is not something we should continue. However, if we can say that these student athletes are doing well then we must ask if our athletic program has given them something positive? Our student athletes are succeeding at a really good rate. We subsidize a lot of programs across the university. There are two institutions that stand out a lot when you look at women that become leaders and they are athletics and the Girl Scouts." President Papazian will be looking at all the issues and concerns around our athletic program.

Question:
Senator Rodan noted that while the athletics program may be very beneficial to a number of students, this is a small group of students compared to the rest of the student population. It doesn't seem to make sense to spend $16 million on a small group of students, when it could be invested in academic programs and initiatives that support all students.

Answer:
President Papazian commented, "there are a lot of complexities to it including our ability to bring friends to the university. Many of our largest donors came to us through athletics and then supported the College of Education, or the College of Engineering, and those dollars go into the academic programs. We can debate what is the best use of those dollars. I think it is a bigger issue and not a simple issue. When you start to pull apart the threads, at the end of the day there are consequences. I don't see us eliminating athletics. I have no interest in that. I do think there is great value in looking under the hood at it and understanding what we are doing, what the outcomes are, and how that has integrated with our broader mission and values, and then seeing what changes we need to make. This is a conversation we need to have, but it needs to be based on real data, real understanding, and real analysis."

Comment:
Senator Campsey commented that the "African-American Museum in Washington D.C. has a statue with San José State on it. It is a replication of the Smith-Carlos statue. This is how the campus is known. There are some good things about athletics and this is something we can all be proud of."

IV. **Executive Committee Report –**
   A. Executive Committee Minutes –
   EC Minutes of May 23, 2016 – no questions.
   EC Minutes of June 22, 2016 – no questions.
   EC Minutes of July 13, 2016 – no questions.
   EC Minutes of August 3, 2016 – no questions.
   EC Minutes of August 17, 2016 – no questions.
   EC Minutes of August 29, 2016 – no questions.

B. Consent Calendar –
Consent Calendar of September 26, 2016 – approved as amended (47-0-0).
Chair Kimbarow announced that there was a vacancy on the Budget Advisory
Committee for a Senator. Any Senator that is interested in serving should send a
statement of interest to Eva Joice, Senate Administrator, no later than October 7,
2016.

C. Executive Committee Action Items: None

V.   New Business –
A. **Election of Associate Vice Chair**
Chair Kimbarow called for nominations from the floor. There were no additional
nominations. Senator Schultz-Krohn was the only nominee. Senator Schultz-Krohn
presented her candidacy statement to the Senate. The Senate voted by acclamation to
elect Senator Schultz-Krohn as the Associate Vice Chair.

B. **Election of the Faculty-at-Large to the Executive Committee**
Chair Kimbarow called for nominations from the floor. There were no additional
nominations. Senator Riley was the only nominee. Senator Riley presented her
candidacy statement to the Senate. The Senate voted by acclamation to elect Senator
Riley as the Faculty-at-Large to the Executive Committee.

VI.   Unfinished Business: None

VII. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items. In rotation.
A. **Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) –**
Senator Kaufman presented *AS 1625, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to F14-
1, Scheduling of Advance Registration and Priority Registration (First Reading).*
A motion was made and seconded to move this resolution to a final reading. The
motion was approved (36-0-0). **The Senate voted and AS 1625 passed (32-0-4)**.

B. **University Library Board (ULB) – None**
C. **Professional Standards Committee (PS) –**
Senator Peter presented *AS 1630, Amendment A to University Policy S15-1,
Allocation of Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students as per the
Extension to the CFA/CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement 2014-2017 (Final
Reading).* **The Senate voted and AS 1630 passed (38-0-1)**.

Senator Peter presented *AS 1631, Policy Recommendation, To Rescind Amendments
made to S15-7 by the Executive Committee Acting as the Senate Last Summer; The
Amendments Clarified FERP Membership and Year-Long Service on RTP
Committees (Final Reading).* **The Senate voted and AS 1631 failed (1-34-4)**.

D. **Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) – None**

E. Organization and Government Committee (O&G) –
Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1627, Senate Management Resolution, Undergraduate Studies Membership (Final Reading).* Senator Mathur presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change "AVP GUP or designee" to "AVP GUP or Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies (EXO). Senator Rodan presented an amendment to the Mathur Amendment that was friendly to the body to add "if so designated" to "AVP GUP or Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies (EXO)." **The Senate voted and AS 1630 passed as amended (38-0-0)**.

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1628, Policy Recommendation, Modification of Bylaw 15 Pertaining to Editorial Changes of Senate Documents (First Reading).* There were no questions.

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1629, Policy Recommendation: Modification of Bylaw 6: Concurrent Membership on Operating and Policy Committees (First Reading).* There were no questions.

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1626, Policy Recommendation: Modification of Bylaw 6: Conversion of College Seats to At-Large Seats (First Reading).* There were no questions. The Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, asked for clarification if the calendar was to be drafted by the Executive Committee or the Senate Office? Senator Shifflett responded that the Senate Office would draft the calendar and the Executive Committee would approve it.

VIII. State of the University Announcements. Questions. In rotation.
A. Vice President of Finance and Administration –
VP Faas announced that there were over 170 projects being worked on by FDO this summer.

The State Fire Marshall is here today to clear Campus Village 2 (CV2).

The AC is being refurbished in DMH. We have had one open forum and another is planned this Friday at noon in CLK for faculty.

VP Faas will present the University Budget at the October 10, 2016 meeting.

VP Faas and Vice Chair Frazier are co-chairs of the Budget Advisory Committee.

VP Faas has addressed funding for six additional police officers on campus in addition to funding for additional cameras and lighting around campus.

Question:
Q: Will students be allowed back into DMH in January 2017?

Answer:
A: Absolutely

Question:
Q: Will Spartan Bookstore go into its permanent location in the Student Union on November 1, 2016?

Answer:
A: It is scheduled for November 15, 2016. There are some issues there, but we are working on it.

Question:
Q: We were told that the classroom doors that opened out would be changed so they opened in so that the door could be barred after the shooting at Virginia Tech. Subsequently, we were told that because of the fire code that would not be possible. We were told that you could tie up the door apparatus with your belt. However, in Clark Hall the doors open in as opposed to opening out. When the VPAF was asked about this he said that there are different criteria for every door. We asked for a list of the doors and the criteria for each door. However, there was no list of criteria and no list of doors given. CSU Fullerton has recently done an analysis on this and is trying to make their campus more secure. We have more students and faculty here at night than CSU Humboldt has students altogether. We also don't have enough security. Can you shed some light on this issue?

Answer:
A: First, there are many different criteria for doors. It depends on whether the door has to be fire-rated or is just for purposes of a door. If it is fire-rated you can't even put peepholes in it. There truly are different criteria. Clark was a library before it was remodeled, and so the doors have different criteria. VP Faas will talk to his colleagues in CSU Fullerton to see what they are working on and will report back to the Senate. VP Faas reminded Senators that anyone that is here any time of day can call UPD and they will walk you to your car. That is part of what UPD is supposed to do.

B. **Vice President for Student Affairs –**
We have had four weeks of welcome for students. Senators were given a water bottle as a welcome back for the academic year.

Last Thursday the Student Affairs Division had "Live on the Lawn." About 500 students were sitting on their towels on the lawn and enjoying the evening.

Student Affairs launched their new website August 1, 2016. Between August 1 and September 16, 2016, Student Affairs has had 62 students respond that they are

experiencing hunger and housing crises in less than six weeks. Student Affairs is partnering with other agencies in the city and county to provide assistance. Our Student Affairs Division is the first in the CSU to hire a full-time coordinator that will be responsible for coordinating our resources on and off campus and is fully devoted to helping students in crisis situations.

Counseling Services is offering 18 workshops for individuals, and 11 group workshops between now and December 2016. That is 29 workshops being offered for our students.

We have a great student leadership team this fall. They are deeply concerned about our students and are doing a great job.

VP Blaylock commented on what a great leader President Papazian is, and the excellent work she has done since arriving at SJSU. The President's cabinet is a very cohesive group of administrators and VP Blaylock looks forward to working with the Provost and the President this coming year.

Questions:
Senator Buzanski asked VP Blaylock to come to the next Emeritus Faculty Association meeting and speak with them about how they could help support the cause of student hunger and housing needs on campus.

Answer:
VP Blaylock agreed. VP Blaylock announced that there are 15 food pantries on campus, but Student Affairs offers all the services a student needs and not just food pantries. Most of the time crisis situations come up when most people are off campus. We must be able to respond quickly during these times. The crisis team is starting off with $90,000 and this is before any fundraising has been initiated. Student Affairs had to develop a program before they can go out and fundraise. VP Blaylock commented that this program allows them to help students by signing them up for programs they may not even know about. Last week VP Blaylock spoke to a student that told him he has a budget of $20 to eat on for the week. VP Blaylock helped him sign up for CalFresh. By signing up for CalFresh, he will get about $150 a week to eat on. The student was unaware of the services available to him. We must connect to resources on and off campus.

C. **Associated Students President (AS) –**
AS held a retreat over the summer for AS staff and the student government. AS developed three strategic priorities for this academic year and they include improving the student experience, improving campus climate, and sustainability for AS. AS also developed a Spartan Community Fund which will donate $50,000 split among specific departments on campus including MOSAIC, Pride, Gender Equity, Veterans Resource Center, Accessible Education Center, and International House. The purpose of the fund is to help these departments develop any projects or services they

want to introduce. These departments were chosen specifically because they are typically underfunded nationwide.

There are applications online until October 10, 2016 for the "Alternate Spring Break." This is an opportunity for students to get involved and work alongside the local community and take part in any grass root efforts going on there.

AS has a new Vice President and he is Eric Medrano.

AS has merged its Computer Services and Print shop, and it is now the Print and Technology Center and is over by the ATMs in the East wing of the Student Union.

The AS Transportation Department has sent out over 5,000 Clipper Cards to students.

This Thursday, September 29, 2016, there is a Town Hall Meeting from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. and will include council members.

Please reach out to students and let them know that, AS isn't just the student government. AS employs lots of students and has many scholarship opportunities.

D. Vice President for University Advancement – None

E. CSU Statewide Senators –
Some of the resolutions the CSU Statewide Senate adopted included receiving the Quantitative Reasoning Taskforce Report and then asking for ASCSU involvement in implementing the taskforce report.

The CSU Statewide Senate also passed a resolution supporting Proposition 55 which extends the higher tax rate on the highest income earners in California and the proceeds benefit K-14.

There was a lot of discussion about including the ASCSU in decision-making, or maybe reversing some of the things that came out of the Chancellor's Office recently that did not involve consent of the ASCSU.

The ASCSU is blocked from discussion with the Chancellor's Office on Intellectual Property Rights and Academic Freedom. The reason the Chancellor's Office gave is that they are part of collective bargaining. The CFA sent a letter to the Chancellor's Office saying that the ASCSU can work on any issue pertaining to Academic Freedom and it is not a bargaining issue, but the Chancellor's Office has not responded to this.

Our Faculty Trustee will not be running for the position again and nominees are being solicited from all campuses for the position. Senator Sabalius plans on running.

The Chancellor's Office announced a one size fits all resolution to the C vs. C- issue for core GE. The Chancellor's Office said that a C- would count even if it did not count on the campus you took it at. This is likely to be reversed and the new rule will most likely be that it will count if it counted on the campus you took it at.

The Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Report recommends a 4th year of Math in high school, and for us to have quantitative reasoning across the curriculum.

F. Provost –
Provost Feinstein announced that he and his staff conducted research on faculty and department chair salary parity on a per diem basis. What the Provost found was that chairs were, on average, making less than faculty on a daily basis. Starting January 1, 2017, Provost Feinstein is going to fix this. The Provost will be investing approximately $190,000 across the campus to resolve this issue.

The Provost and several others, including Debra Griffith and Stacy Gleixner, gave a presentation at the Chancellor's Office on Student Success that was very well received. However, one concern Provost Feinstein has is that a review last week of the impact all our efforts have had on average unit load revealed that we will start the fall semester with an average unit load of 12.74. Before we began our efforts, we were at 12.4 units. This is not a lot of growth or movement.

However, we have been successful with getting our first-time freshmen to increase their unit load. The average unit load for our first-time freshmen is now over 13. What seems to be happening is that students coming here for the first time are more willing to take 15 units. However, our sophomores, juniors, and seniors are mostly not taking 15 units. Provost Feinstein is not sure where the problems are and asked for help from the faculty. If we cannot increase our student unit load to 15 units, then our students will most likely not graduate in 4 years

This Friday, September 30, 2016, there will be an all-day Student Success Summit. Martha Kanter, the former Under Secretary for Education, will be here to discuss what can be done to regarding college readiness, and/or remediation. More than 50% of our students in the CSU need English remediation upon arrival. At SJSU, 30% need remediation.

Provost Feinstein was speaking with Dean Chin. He was surprised to learn that more than one-third of all K-12 teacher hires in the valley are SJSU graduates.

Question:
Senator Shifflett asked if the Provost had "any idea what the impact of summer bridge or other crossover programs are with respect to impacting unit load?'

Answer:
Provost Feinstein responded that this was the first year of expanding the summer bridge program and that it may take several years to see what the impact of this program will be. The Provost will look into this.

IX.   Special Committee Reports –

A. Faculty Office Hours Report:

Senator Ken Peter presented Scott Heil, AVP of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics (IEA). AVP Heil presented the results of the Faculty Office Hours Survey. AVP Heil announced that the Office of IEA chose to do a qualitative survey. Students were asked a whole range of questions about the ease of access in reaching faculty, the quality of contact they had with faculty, the general availability during office hours, and availability outside of office hours.

The general result of the survey was favorable to the new office-hours policy. Students said they had good access to their professors and in many instances preferred electronic contact to face-to-face contact. There were no systematic problems gaining access to faculty.

There were a couple of comments from the survey where students thought improvement could be made. A few students did complain that during peak periods such as midterms and finals, or when major assignments were due that there could be lines of students waiting to see a faculty member. Only undergraduate students were surveyed.

The next review of the Faculty Office Hours policy will be five years from this report.

Question:
Q: This survey was limited to a small number of students so how can you be sure it represents most student views?

Answer:
A: We can't. However, IEA felt that the responses did not indicate a systematic problem and/or the need for a larger and more in-depth study and were indicative of the views of the general student population.

B. Academic Integrity Report:
Chair Kimbarow introduced Shannon Quihuiz, the Director of Student Conduct and Ethical Development. Director Quihuiz distributed the annual report on Academic Integrity to Senators.

11

Question:
Q: What are you seeing in terms of changes and trends in kinds of issues we are having over the past few years?

Answer:
A: The use of electronic means for cheating and plagiarism. Students are utilizing very unique and smart ways to collaborate with each other or to use other people's information in their particular paper. Last year students utilized of a social media app that was used to collaborate, resulting in over 35 students being found responsible for cheating behavior. This is the trend we are seeing. The Office of Student Conduct and Ethical Development has created an online canvas course on plagiarism for those students that have been caught the first time. There is also a canvas resource for faculty to use that you can assign your students in class to try to be more on the preventative side. First-time violations usually result in academic probation, and then we do something around education. Students respond better to the individual online courses in this area.

X.   **Adjournment –** The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

2016/2017 Academic Senate

MINUTES
October 10, 2016

I. **The meeting was called to order at 2:02 p.m. and roll call was taken by the Senate Administrator. Fifty Senators were present.**

Ex Officio:
Present: Kimbarow, Sabalius, Van Selst, Lee, Perea
Absent: None

Administrative Representatives:
Present: Papazian, Feinstein, Faas, Blaylock
Absent: Lanning

Deans:
Present: Green, Jacobs, Schutten
Absent: Stacks

Students:
Present: Caesar, Medina, Spica, Balal, Torres-Mendoza
Absent: Medrano

Alumni Representative:
Present: Walters
Absent: None

Emeritus Representative:
Present: Buzanski
Absent: None

Honorary Representative:
Present: Lessow-Hurley
Absent: None

General Unit Representatives:
Present: Matoush, Kauppila Higgins, Trousdale
Absent: None

CASA Representatives:
Present: Schultz-Krohn, Lee, Shifflett, Grosvenor, Sen
Absent: None

COB Representatives:
Present: Reade, Rodan, Campsey
Absent: None

EDUC Representatives:
Present: Laker, Mathur
Absent: None

ENGR Representatives:
Present: Sullivan-Green, Chung
Absent: Hamedi-Hagh

H&A Representatives:
Present: Frazier, Grindstaff, Riley Ormsbee, Miller
Absent: Khan

SCI Representatives:
Present: Kaufman, White, Cargill, Boekema
Absent: None

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

II. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–** None.

III. **Communications and Questions –**
    A. From the Chair of the Senate:
        We are trying for the very first time this year to have a separate Senate meeting just for the University and Academic Affairs budget presentations. The budget presentations in the past have been rushed due to other Senate business in the same meeting.

We were going to do a test of the clickers today, but we have not used the clickers for over six months and the unbeknownst to us, the manufacturer issued a software update for the receiver that we need to download before we can test them.

Many of you have expressed concerns to members of the Executive Committee about the funding and hiring of a new Vice President. The Executive Committee had a discussion with the President regarding this last week. Chair Kimbarow is very comfortable assuring the Senate that the explanation for the decision to make this organizational change is sound, and that subsequent administrator searches will follow policy. The Executive Committee was also reassured that this will not negatively affect the Academic Affairs division. President Papazian will speak to this issue when she arrives.

B. From the President of the University:
The summit on September 30, 2016 focused on education and college readiness. This was a really important day for us on a number of levels. The collaborative effort between Provost Andy Feinstein and VP Reggie Blaylock around the Student Success Initiative presented SJSU as the leader in creating an environment where we can talk about our prospective students and the issues around college readiness in a way that includes our community partners, community college partners, and also K-12 superintendents.

The keynote speaker for this summit was Martha Kanter, former Under Secretary of Education, also a former faculty member and leader at DeAnza/Foothill Community College. There was a very rich conversation based on research questions. The summit focused some on Mathematics and how critical 8th grade is. Then they talked about 3rd grade, teacher preparation, and math readiness. Assemblyman Evan Low was very interested in what he might take away from this in terms of actual legislations/bills.

President Papazian just came from one of those states where the legislature tried to step in and run the universities. About four years ago that state's legislature got so fed up with the higher education sector that they stepped in and said you are not going to be able to do developmental courses any longer in the way that you are doing them.

Katy Murphy wrote a long story in the San José Mercury News focused primarily on the community colleges and this question. President Papazian was surprised SJSU wasn't included in the article since it takes the whole ecosystem including K-16, and not just K-14.

The summit also focused on what could be done in terms of real partnerships. The student success teams led by the Provost and VP Blaylock will be looking at ways to partner with the community colleges in particular. President Papazian has already had meetings with the new Chancellors of our community colleges. Their talks have included some innovative possibilities, but they all agree that our students must come first. This means doing whatever it takes to ensure our students are successful and college ready.

In the community colleges this means building some of their dual enrollment programs, where a student in 10th, 11th, and 12th grade might take a college-level course. This partnership is between the community colleges and the high schools in particular. At SJSU, we need to ask where do we as a university fit in, and how might we use the research that shows that students that take two or three kinds of remediation in their first year which prevents them from getting into credit-bearing courses have very small chances for success. These students tend to drop out, or they use their financial aid so their resources dwindle, and they haven't actually moved into a credit-bearing program yet. We are considering what part of this could be fixed in partnership with community colleges. The community colleges and the 4-year universities often share a lot of faculty that are in the part-time ranks. The summit focused on ways we can bring together faculty that are teaching in both places to build a partnership that ensures a rigor we want to see, and that students that transfer from the community college system after getting their Associates degree are as successful in completing their Bachelor's degree as the students that start at a 4-year university.

The other piece is the re-scanning of the high schools to make sure we are not waiting until it is too late, for instance the four years of Mathematics that should be taken in high school. These are the kinds of things that can be done in 10th, 11th, and 12th grade as well as in the summer. SJSU piloted some of that this year with the Spartan Scholars Program. There is more of this that we can do.

The day of the summit was a very important day. President Papazian was so pleased that SJSU had really stepped up as the leader in this conversation. SJSU is the only major 4-year public university in this region, and we also have a very robust College of Education that is preparing many of the K-12 teachers in the region. SJSU has a stake in these teachers and in their continuing professional development.

SJSU also needs to ensure that we are at the table when legislation is being drafted. If we are not at the table and don't take care of things, our legislators will step in. Remember that our legislators are hearing from their constituents and they want to make a difference and be re-elected. This is why it is important that we build those relationships. We have a great deal of professional expertise on this campus in a number of areas including content, education, and academic student success. The Glazer bill is a good example of legislators not thinking of the unintended consequences of a bill on our CSU campuses, such as what happens to all the other students and additional costs. We need to be at the table to recognize when there is a problem and to speak up. It takes all of us at the table to make good and positive

change. Every decision we make needs to put student welfare and student success at the core. If it makes more sense for a program that we have been running to be taught at the community college because it is more effective, then we should support that because the impact should be on what students need. We must stay focused on the students, so let's collaborate and work together on that.

Questions:
Q: The ASCSU was at the table and was in contact with the legislators constantly about making improvements in that bill, but we had only so much pull.
A: There are a number of avenues to address issues, and certainly our ASCSU is really helpful. The ASCSU addresses these issues across CSU campuses.

Provost Feinstein commented "this is just the first step and not the last. In fact, today the notes from those meetings will be made available publically. Our goal is to have another meeting in January 2017. Two years ago 45% of our students needed remediation and this year we are at 29%, so a lot of the work has been done. However, that should be down to zero. We are committed to that, and want to make sure that occurs."

VP Blaylock commented that most of the people in the room did not know each other and this was an excellent opportunity to meet people. Also, there was no finger-pointing or placing blame.

President Papazian introduced Jaye Bailey, the new Chief of Staff and VP for Organizational Development. The push in Jaye's appointment was really to get someone into the Chief of Staff role. We needed full-time leadership in Student Success so Stacy Gleixner stepped up. There were some questions that arose and the Executive Committee had a robust discussion about Jaye's appointment. President Papazian said that "given the nature of the Chief of Staff piece, I elected to go ahead and move forward on the appointment with somebody that I had worked with for 4 ½ years, that I managed to persuade to come out here. There was a certain urgency in some issues that needed to be addressed."

One of those issues was the need to move Human Resources and the personnel side of Faculty Affairs under Jaye's purview. The academic part of Faculty Affairs, which includes RTP, sabbaticals, and faculty development, will remain under the Provost's purview. What has become clear to President Papazian in the few months she has been here is that there is a serious issue on this campus. Right now HR functions are spread out in too many places and there is a need for better communication and integration of processes. There have been lots of investigations and issues that President Papazian cannot speak to due to confidentiality restrictions. For personnel matters, President Papazian is ultimately accountable and control of these matters needs to be with the President's Office.

At the same time the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, to which the Title IX

Officer reports, will work in collaboration with the Chief of Staff and VP for Organizational Development. The new Title IX Officer just started on Monday and her name is Natalie Potts. Natalie will report to the Chief Diversity Officer, Kathleen Wong. The Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion will also report to the President.

There was some concern from the faculty leaders on the Executive Committee about how this will work on the faculty side. It will probably take at least a semester to fully evaluate how the flow works and what makes sense, and it may end up that only a small part of faculty affairs is transferred under the purview of the Chief of Staff/VP for Organizational Development. We need to give the Chief of Staff, Director of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, and Title IX Officer time to evaluate how these offices will work together.

Questions:
Q: Is it your intention that the authorization and distribution of faculty lines will continue to operate through the Provost/VP of Academic Affairs?
A: Absolutely. President Papazian noted she is a former Provost. The only exception might be the actual authorization of funded lines in terms of the total amount, because that is ultimately a budgetary issue. Once we've allocated and said we can fund so many lines, the President's Office is out of it.

Q: Can you shed any light on the HGH (Hugh Gillis Hall) episode, whatever that may be?
A: No.
Q: My question stems from an article in the SF Chronicle about African-American students complaining about some hate leaflets found in HGH that specifically targeted African-American students.
A: President Papazian did not see the article but is aware of some flyers from the Asian Students Against Black Lives Matter that were written in a language other than English. Kathy Wong is working on this in conjunction with the University Police Department (UPD) to see if they can pinpoint where the flyers came from. It seems to be a non-affiliate from outside the campus that came through and put up a few flyers, but UPD is working with the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusiveness on this. President Papazian is not sure where they are in the investigation, but the flyers were taken down immediately.

IV. **Executive Committee Report –**
   A. **Executive Committee Minutes – None**.

   B. **Consent Calendar –**
      Consent Calendar of October 10, 2016 – approved as amended (49-0-0).

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

V.   **New Business – None**

VI.   **Unfinished Business: None**

VII.   **Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items. In rotation.**
        A. **Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) – None**
        B. Organization and Government Committee (O&G) – None
        C. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) – None
        D. University Library Board (ULB) – None
        E. Professional Standards Committee (PS) – None

VIII. **State of the University Announcements. Questions. In rotation.**
        A. CSU Statewide Senators –
        B. Provost –
        C. Vice President of Finance and Administration –
        D. Vice President for Student Affairs –
        E. Associated Students President (AS) –
        F. Vice President for University Advancement – None

IX.   **Special Committee Reports –**
        A: University Budget Presentation by Charlie Faas, VP of Administration and Finance
        (See University Budget Presentation PowerPoint attached, and/or the meeting recording on the Senate website at http://www.sjsu.edu/Senate/docs/sminsf16-3.MP3 (forward to 0.2.20)

        B. Academic Affairs Budget Presentation by Andy Feinstein, Provost and VP of Academic Affairs
        (See Academic Affairs Budget Presentation PowerPoint attached, and/or the meeting recording on the Senate website at http://www.sjsu.edu/Senate/docs/sminsf16-3.MP3 (forward to 1.23.43)

X.   **Adjournment –** The meeting adjourned at 4:01p.m.

Executive Committee Meeting Minutes
September 12, 2016
12-1:30 p.m., ADM 167

Present: Kimbarow, Peter, Shifflett, Schultz-Krohn, Faas, Pérea, Mathur,
             Papazian, Frazier, Feinstein, Blaylock

Absent: Lanning, Lee, Kaufman

1.   The Executive Committee minutes of August 29, 2016 were approved
      (11-0-0).

2.   There was no dissent to the consent calendar of September 12, 2016.

3.   Updates:

      From the Chair of the Senate:

      The Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC) held its first meeting
      today. Another meeting is scheduled for next week. The SPSC will be
      closing out Vision 17 and starting on a new strategic plan.

4.   The Executive Committee went into a confidential Executive Session.

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

These minutes were taken by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on
September 12, 2016, and were edited by Chair Michael Kimbarow on September
14, 2016. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on October
3, 2016.

Executive Committee Meeting Minutes
October 3, 2016
12-1:30 p.m., ADM 167

Present: Kimbarow, Peter, Shifflett, Schultz-Krohn, Faas, Mathur, Papazian, Frazier, Lee, Kaufman, Riley

Absent: Lanning, Blaylock, Peréa, Feinstein

1.   The Executive Committee minutes of September 12, 2016 were approved (9-0-1).

2.   There was no dissent to the consent calendar of October 3, 2016. The Executive Committee approved the appointment of Aaron Vogel as the Graduate Student on the Strategic Planning Steering Committee (10-0-0).

3.   Updates:

From the President:
The President noted that the students that lived in the bricks waiting for CV2 to open have told her they made so many friends living there they were sad to move.

The campus is vulnerable and there are some real issues with personal email being sent to and from campus accounts. The President will be considering what can be done to address this.

From the Vice President of Administration and Finance (VPAF):
The VPAF is working on the University Budget Presentation he will give to the Senate at the October 10, 2016 meeting.

DMH is on track to reopen in January 2017.

Students have moved into CV2 and are really happy with the facilities.

4.   The Executive Committee went into a confidential Executive Session.

5.   The meeting adjourned at 1:38 p.m.

These minutes were taken by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on October 3, 2016, and were edited by Chair Michael Kimbarow on October 4, 2016. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on October 17, 2016.

6

Policy Recommendation
Departmental Voting Rights

9

10 Legislative History: Rescinds F66-6 related to voting privileges for faculty on leave.
11 Rescinds F02-4 and S98-2, both of which pertained to departmental voting rights. F02-4
12 arose from deliberations about whether and how temporary faculty may participate in
13 the nomination and selection of department chairs, and a concern that the previous
14 policy (S98-2) appeared to exclude temporary faculty from such participation. Rescinds
15 F07-5 regarding voting privileges for faculty assigned to more than one representative
16 unit.

17

18 Whereas,   The voting rights associated with decisions relating to policies,
19   curricula, and other business of academic departments requires
20   clarification; and

21

22 Whereas,   Meaningful engagement of departmental faculty in decision making is an
23   essential component of shared governance, assuring the integrity of
24   departmental business, and our commitments to students; now, therefore,
25   be it

26

27 Resolved: That S98-2, F07-5 and F66-6 be replaced by this policy, and be it further

28

29 Resolved: That the administration, in consultation with the Senate, investigate
30   options and subsequently acquire an appropriate resource to facilitate
31   online voting at all levels (department, college, university), and be it further

32

33 Resolved: That the attached policy be implemented following approval by the
34   President, and be it further

35

36 Resolved: That until such time as S14-8 (selection & review of department chairs) is
37   updated, section 1.a. of F02-4 will remain in effect while all other
38   provisions of F02-4 will be replaced by this policy. Thus, lecturer votes
39   related to department chair recommendations remain advisory. S14-8 is
40   presently under revision by Professional Standards. Once their work is
41   completed, this section of F02-4 will become obsolete.

42

43   1.a. Names for inclusion in the list of qualified (tenured or probationary)
44   faculty to serve as department chair may be recommended by all regular
45   and temporary faculty in the department. Normally, a department meeting

46   shall be held at which persons whose names are proposed as chair shall
47   be open for discussion, and all regular and temporary faculty may attend
48   and participate. All faculty may then vote by secret ballot (proportional
49   votes for part-time faculty, as provided below) on all candidates proposed
50   and willing to serve. The name or names of those receiving a majority vote
51   of the regular (tenured and probationary) faculty shall be forwarded to the
52   President via the College Dean as the nominee(s) of the department. A
53   statement of the vote of all faculty, broken down into two categories – vote
54   by regular faculty and by temporary faculty, including the actual number of
55   votes cast in each category - will be forwarded to the President via the
56   College Dean for information.

57

58 Rationale: A number of voting related issues have arisen over the intervening years
59 following implementation of F02-4. These include consideration of the various
60 procedures employed in academic departments for such issues as curricular changes,
61 operating policies, determinations of what issues require formal or informal votes by
62 faculty, implications of appointment fractions, and the opportunities as well as the
63 limitations of electronic voting resources. This proposed update to the departmental
64 voting rights policy seeks to provide greater clarity and guidance on such issues. In
65 addition, as revisions were made, voting guidelines found in both the Senate
66 constitution (Article II section 3c) and bylaws (1.7) were taken into consideration.

67

68 Retention of section 1.a. of F02-4 is needed to temporarily bridge the gap between
69 rescinding F02-4 and update of S14-8 (selection & review of department chairs).
70 Subsequently the revision of S14-8 will contain all information regarding department
71 chair nomination and selection procedures.

72

73 Note: Regarding department chair assignments, the current CSU/CFA Agreement
74 states that:

75

76 20.30 Department chairs shall normally be selected from the list of tenured or
77 probationary faculty employees recommended by the department for the
78 assignment.
79 20.31 Such department chairs shall perform duties and carry out responsibilities
80 assigned by the President
81 20.32 Such department chairs shall be appointed by the President and shall serve at
82 the pleasure of the President.

83

84 Approved: 10/3/16
85 Vote: 6-0-1
86 Present: Curry, Bailey, Shifflett, Rajkovic, Higgins, Boekema, Boylan-Ashraf
87 Absent: Grosvenor, Laker, Ormsbee, Hart
88 Financial Impact: Depending on decisions regarding tools for online voting, one-time
89   costs for the purchase of software can be expected.
90 Workload Impact: Potential reduction as a result of the clarification of processes and
91   potential prevention of time consuming corrections resulting from

92   inappropriate procedures.

93

95
96   The ideals of higher education are rooted in principles of democracy and shared
97   governance. This policy affirms the primacy of faculty members in decision-making
98   related to the academic/educational matters of departments. The voting rights
99   described in this policy exclude all personnel matters. Separate policies govern matters
100   (including voting procedures) pertaining to Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (S15-7)
101   and the Selection and Review of Department Chairs (S14-8).
102
103   **1. Definitions**
104
105   1.1 Departmental voting rights are the rights granted to faculty to have a voice, through
106   voting, on matters pertaining to their roles and responsibilities related to the
107   department(s) they are formally affiliated with, including but not limited to governance,
108   curriculum, and leadership.
109   1.1.1   Engagement in deliberations prior to voting should be the norm as it
110   leads to more informed decision making.
111   1.1.2   Those leading departments and/or committees should strive to
112   make agendas and supporting materials available in a reasonable
113   time in advance of meetings.
114
115   1.2 Department of permanent assignment. For purposes of this policy, "department of
116   permanent assignment" refers to the academic department or equivalent unit officially
117   designated for a faculty member at the time of appointment, or the department to which
118   he/she has been subsequently officially reassigned on a permanent basis.
119
120   1.3 Formal vote. A formal vote is one in which there has minimally been a motion, a
121   second to the motion, and discussion preceding a vote. Unless otherwise stipulated by
122   the department's regular faculty, Roberts rules of order shall apply.
123
124   1.4 Faculty. Throughout the policy 'regular' faculty includes tenured and tenure track
125   faculty and 'temporary' faculty includes all other part-time and full time lecturers.
126
127   **2. Department Faculty Voting**
128
129   2.1 Voting by all regular faculty (tenured, tenure track) is required for the nomination of
130   department chairs; merging, dividing, transferring, or eliminating academic units; and
131   department name changes. The voting method will be determined by the regular faculty.
132   2.1.1 For development and/or changes to departmental curricula, curricular
133   policies, and program requirements for students (inclusive of establishing or
134   modifying courses, standard texts and materials), voting by regular faculty is
135   required. Depending on a department's structure and size, voting may be
136   conducted in representative committees or entail voting by all regular faculty in a
137   department.
138   2.1.1.1 When a department establishes a committee responsible for
139   decision-making pertaining to curricula, a mechanism needs to be in place

140   that permits a regular faculty member not on the curriculum committee to
141   request a review of a specific committee decision. This request must be
142   voted on by the regular department faculty, in order for a committee
143   decision to be reviewed.

144
145 2.2 Departments may choose to vote (or not vote) on a range of matters beyond those
146 specified in section 2.1. However, faculty voting rights do not extend to matters that may
147 contravene university policies, violate the Collective Bargaining Agreement, interfere
148 with departmental management and participation in university governance, or fall under
149 the purview of the department chair or equivalent.

150
151 **3. Regular (tenured, tenure track) Faculty Departmental Voting Rights**

152
153 3.1 Most departmental educational and academic decisions are entrusted to the regular
154 faculty. Therefore, unless specified in other policies, voting rights for all departmental
155 curricula, curricular policies, and personnel matters, including constitution of decision-
156 making committees for these matters, shall be reserved to regular faculty.

157
158 3.2 Regular faculty members have departmental voting rights in proportion to their
159 permanent assignment in a department and can choose not to exercise that right (not
160 vote).

161
162 3.3 Regular faculty members with teaching assignments outside their department of
163 permanent assignment may request departmental voting rights proportional to their
164 assignment in that department. The faculty member may subsequently be granted
165 departmental voting rights following a vote of the regular faculty in that department.
166 Faculty retain their full voting rights in their department of permanent assignment.

167
168   3.3.1 Departmental voting rights, when granted, take effect at the beginning of the
169   next semester (fall or spring) and remain in effect throughout the faculty member's
170   service in the department.

171
172 3.4 Leaves. Regular faculty members on an approved leave retain departmental voting
173 rights provided they take part in the deliberations preceding a vote as described in
174 1.1.1.

175
176 3.5 Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP). Faculty participating in FERP retain
177 departmental voting rights. They retain a full vote regardless of their academic
178 assignment in a given semester and can vote provided they take part in the
179 deliberations preceding a vote as described in 1.1.1.

180
181 3.6 Regular faculty suspended from a department retain their departmental voting
182 rights.

183

184 3.7 Departmental voting rights of regular faculty are suspended for any semester in
185 which the individual holds a full-time administrative (i.e. MPP), or other full-time non-
186 faculty position, in the university.
187
188 3.8 Departmental voting rights of regular faculty members end upon termination of
189 employment.
190
191 3.9. There is no right nor duty for anyone other than regular faculty members to
192 participate in discussions about, or serve on committees that deliberate matters
193 entrusted to the regular faculty. Any person sitting with committees deliberating these
194 matters who is not a regular faculty member may not vote on them.
195
196 **4. Temporary Faculty Departmental Voting Rights.**
197
198 4.1 Temporary faculty members have proportional voting rights in the department(s) in
199 which they serve equal to the proportion of time they are teaching in the department(s),
200 not to exceed 1.0 in any department.
201
202 4.2 Temporary faculty members can participate in votes on departmental matters
203 excluding those relegated to regular faculty. Temporary faculty can choose not to
204 exercise their voting rights (not vote).
205
206 4.3 Proportional voting rights of temporary faculty members may fluctuate with fall and
207 spring appointments.
208
209 4.4 Leaves. Temporary faculty members on partial leave retain the proportional voting
210 rights of their teaching assignment ~~and can vote provided they take part in the~~
211 ~~deliberations preceding the vote as described in 1.1.1.~~ Those on full leave relinquish all
212 voting rights.
213
214 4.5 Temporary faculty suspended from a department retain their departmental voting
215 rights.
216
217 4.6 Departmental voting rights of temporary faculty are suspended for any semester in
218 which the individual holds a full-time administrative (i.e. MPP), or other full-time non-
219 faculty position, in the university.
220
221 4.7 Departmental voting rights of temporary faculty members end upon termination of
222 employment.
223
224 **5. Department Chair Voting Rights.**
225
226 5.1 As primary steward of a department, the permanent department chair has full voting
227 rights in the department they chair during their term regardless of the level of
228 assignment (i.e., 0.4, 0.6).

229 5.2 Faculty assigned as interim or acting chair for a department outside their
230 department of permanent assignment have full voting rights in the department they are
231 serving in as interim or acting chair. They also retain full voting rights in their permanent
232 department. They can vote on all 'home' departmental matters provided they take part
233 in the deliberations preceding the vote as described in 1.1.1.
234
235 **6. Visiting faculty, students, staff, and other non-faculty voting rights.**
236
237 While visiting faculty, students, staff, or other non-faculty individuals may participate on
238 some departmental committees, organizations, and other such groups, they may not be
239 granted departmental voting rights.
240
241 **7. Voting Methods and Procedures.**
242
243 7.1 Regular Department faculty will determine the acceptable mechanism and timeline
244 for voting (e.g., paper ballots, double envelope, email, online, show of hands) for
245 department matters in general. They may select different methods for various types of
246 decisions unless otherwise stipulated or precluded by University policy, collective
247 bargaining agreement, and/or laws.
248
249   7.1.1 Because of the importance of deliberations in resolving conflicts and
250   determining policies, proxy and absentee voting on departmental matters is
251   permissible only if authorized by a specific departmental policy.
252
253   7.1.2 Any selected method must include a process for verifying the proportion and
254   eligibility of those voting, and provide the option of a vote to 'abstain'.
255
256   7.1.3 Formal voting shall only be conducted after a proposal has been discussed.
257   Those eligible to vote are those who participate in deliberations in person prior to the
258   vote (inclusive of remote attendance where the department allows for attendance
259   remotely).
260
261 7.2 If the Department does not have an established voting procedure at the time a
262 decision is to be made, a vote by secret ballot conducted by the chair and documented
263 in meeting minutes shall be the default practice.
264
265   7.2.1 When a vote has been by secret ballot, the method used and the reporting of
266   results must be done in such a way as to not reveal the identity of voters even to the
267   chair.
268
269 7.3 Within departmental committees, for matters other than those that require formal
270 votes, regular faculty members can decide what process they will use for decision
271 making (e.g., formal votes, consensus, secret ballots).
272

7   **Policy Recommendation**
8   **Modification of Bylaw 6.13: Conversion of College**
9   **Seats to at-large Seats**
10

11   Legislative History: Modifies bylaw 6.13 which pertains to the timing of the change in
12   college seats to at-large seats on committees.
13

14   **Whereas:**   Vacancies may have arisen since the call in the spring, and it is important
15   that colleges have the opportunity to fill their vacant seats, and

16   **Whereas:**   It is critical that committees have a full slate of members as soon as
17   possible to make timely progress on their work, and

18   **Whereas:**   Due to the requirement to approve the at large seats on consent calendars
19   at both the Senate Executive committee and the Senate, the length of time
20   seats go unfilled under the current provision is significantly longer than
21   four weeks. Depending on the calendar, it can be at best seven weeks
22   and as long as nine weeks, therefore be it

23   Resolved   That bylaw 6.13 be modified as follows:
24

25   a) Each year the Senate Executive committee will create a calendar for appointing
26   faculty to operating committees (referred to below as "appointment calendar"). The
27   calendar will be structured such that colleges are given ample notification of vacancies
28   before the start of the fall semester and also allow for faculty-at-large appointments to
29   be confirmed at the first Senate meeting of the semester.

30   b) Notwithstanding the provisions of bylaw 6.10.1, college seats on both policy and
31   operating committees for which no faculty from that college willing to serve have been
32   found by the date specified on the appointment calendar shall become faculty-at-large
33   seats for the balance of the academic year.

34   c) By the date specified on the appointment calendar, the Associate Vice Chair of the
35   Senate shall inform each college representative and college dean which of that
36   college's operating committee seats are still vacant and invite them to recommend
37   faculty for those seats within one week's time. The college representative and deans
38   shall be reminded that the seats will become faculty-at-large seats for the year if no
39   college faculty to fill them can be found. The dean's recommendations shall be
40   forwarded to the college's Committee on Committees representatives who shall present

41 one name to the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate to be reported to the Senate or to
42 the Executive Committee, as appropriate under bylaw 6.2.

43 d) By the date specified on the appointment calendar, all vacant college seats on
44 operating committees for which no faculty from the college have been recommended
45 under paragraph (c) above (or otherwise identified) shall become faculty-at-large seats
46 for the balance of the year and all members of the Committee on Committees shall be
47 requested to supply names of faculty from any representative unit to fill these
48 vacancies.

49 e) By the date specified on the appointment calendar, all vacant college seats on policy
50 committees shall become faculty-at-large seats for the balance of the year. First priority
51 in filling these vacancies shall be given to elected faculty representatives not assigned
52 to other policy committees. If all elected faculty representatives (other than Senate
53 officers) have been appointed to policy committees and there are policy committee
54 seats still remaining vacant, they shall be filled as provided in 6.13c for policy
55 committees and 6.13d for operating committees.

56 f) The Associate Vice Chair of the Senate shall coordinate this selection process so as
57 to maintain as far as possible a representative balance across committees and shall
58 report one name for each vacancy to the Senate or the Executive Committee as
59 appropriate under bylaw 6.2.

60 g) Elected faculty representatives (other than Senate officers) not appointed to seats
61 designated for representative units and also not appointed to faculty-at-large seats as
62 provided above shall be appointed as additional members-at-large of policy committees.
63 If there is only one such member, s/he shall be appointed to the Organization and
64 Government Committee. If there is a second, s/he shall be appointed to the Instruction
65 and Student Affairs Committee. A third shall be appointed to the Professional Standards
66 Committee and a fourth to the Curriculum and Research Committee. The provision shall
67 be implemented in a manner consistent with Academic Senate bylaw 6.10.1.

68

69 Rationale: The length of time seats go unfilled under the current provisions in Senate
70 bylaws often leaves committees with vacancies. For example, in the fall 2016 semester,
71 following the four-week rule, the earliest the executive committee of the Senate could
72 review a consent calendar for at-large appointments would be during their meeting the
73 first week of October. Connecting the calendar to the first Senate meeting allows for the
74 flexibility needed in setting deadlines for the transition of college seats to at-large seats.

75

76

77

78	Approved:	9/12/16
79	Vote:	9-0-0
80	Present:	Gleixner, Laker, Curry, Shifflett, Rajkovic, Higgins, Ormsbee,
81		Boekema, Grosvenor
82	Absent:	Medrano
83	Financial Impact:	None expected
84	Workload Impact:	No change from current situation.

San José State University
Academic Senate
Organization and Government Committee   AS 1628
October 24, 2016
Final Reading

Policy Recommendation
Modification of Bylaw 15 Pertaining to Editorial Changes of Senate Documents

Legislative History: Modifies bylaw 15c passed in Spring 2016 which pertains to the correction of errors in policy recommendations and Senate management resolutions that would not change the intent of the policy recommendation or resolution.

Whereas: The revisions made to bylaw 15c in Spring 2016 were intended to permit changes to be made to documents by the Executive Committee rather than have minor matters brought to the full senate, and

Whereas: The language in the modification was subsequently found to actually restrict action, therefore be it

Resolved   That section c of bylaw 15 be modified as follows:

c) When a policy recommendation or Senate management resolution is found to contain errors, that when corrected would not change the intent of the policy ~~recommendation~~ or resolution, the Senate Chair, following consultation with and unanimous consent from, the Executive Committee can correct the error(s) ~~prior to forwarding the policy recommendation to the president or implementation of a Senate management resolution~~. Such editorial corrections shall be recorded in the Senate Executive Committee meeting minutes.

Rationale: This modification recognizes that the need for changes are often not detected until after a recommendation has gone to the President or has been implemented. The matter of timing should not result in the Senate having to take up discussion of changes to documents that do not change the intent of a policy or resolution.

Approved: 9/19/16
Vote: 9-0-0
Present: Laker, Curry, Shifflett, Rajkovic, Higgins, Ormsbee, Boekema, Medrano, Grosvenor
Absent: Gleixner
Financial Impact: None expected
Workload Impact: No change from current situation.

Amendment B to
University Policy S15-6
Appointment of Regular Faculty Employees;
Composition of Recruitment Committees

Resolved: That S15-6 be amended as shown in the strikeout and underline of the following excerpt from the policy.

Rationale: This revision of S15-6 adds flexibility to the composition of faculty recruitment committees, so that departments (at their option) may elect members from outside their department to assist on searches. This may be especially useful for departments who are seeking to recruit faculty with interdisciplinary perspectives and desire the help of faculty from other departments.

Approved: September 19, 2016

Vote: 8-0-0

Present: Peter, Green, White, Lee, Reade, Kauppila, Caesar, Hamedi-Hagh

Absent: None

Financial Impact: No direct impacts. It is possible that this policy, by clarifying process, could result in some savings.

Workload Impact: No direct impacts, although the clarification of methods for selection and review of department chairs could potentially prevent some time consuming failures of process.

Amendment B to
University Policy S15-6
Appointment of Regular Faculty Employees;
Composition of Recruitment Committees

…………..

3.2   Composition of department recruitment committees

3.2.1   Recruitment committees shall be elected by vote of the tenured and probationary faculty of the department by secret ballot.

3.2.2   <u>The size of the recruitment committee shall be determined by the department, and</u> ~~Recruitment committees~~ should preferably contain a minimum of five members but never fewer than three members. <u>Departments may elect members to a recruitment committee from a related discipline outside their department</u>, ~~If a department lacks three qualified members, it may elect a faculty member from a related discipline to serve~~, whose willingness should first be ascertained. <u>External election is required if needed to achieve a minimum of three committee members, but may also be used to broaden the expertise or composition of the committee. The department which will be home to prospective position must always supply the majority of the members of any recruitment committee.</u>

3.2.3   The majority of faculty on any recruitment committee must be tenured and must not have entered an early retirement program. Probationary faculty and faculty in an early retirement program may serve if elected, provided they do not constitute a majority of the committee, and provided that they receive the permission of the President as per the Collective Bargaining Agreement (12.22).[1] That permission must be requested by the Department and is reviewed by the Dean and Faculty Affairs.

3.2.4   If a search is authorized for a tenured position, then the recruitment committee may not include probationary faculty.

3.2.5   The Chair of the Department shall normally be a voting *ex officio* member of the recruitment committee and shall Chair the committee. If the Chair elects not to serve, then the committee shall choose its own Chair from among its elected members.

---

[1] CFA/CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement, 2014-2017. 2

3.2.6 Departments may create independent recruitment committees for each search, or carry out all searches with a standing recruitment committee, provided all recruitment committees conform to the requirements of policy.

3.2.7 Recruitments for department chairs should be conducted in accordance with the provisions of S14-8 (Sect VI.1.)

…………..

6
7
8   **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**
9   **Adopting New SOTE and SOLATE Instruments**
10
11
12 Resolved: That the attached documents following be adopted as the text for revised
13   Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTE) and Student Opinion of
14   Laboratory Teaching Effectiveness (SOLATE) questionnaires; be it further
15
16 Resolved: That this become effective for the administration of all Spring 2016 SOTEs
17   and SOLATEs.
18
19 *Rationale: F12-6, Evaluation in Effectiveness in Teaching for all Faculty, states:*
20
21   *SERB shall prepare the specific questions and survey instrument to be*
22   *used to measure student opinions of teaching effectiveness. It shall decide*
23   *the scale, format, and layout of the instrument, and determine the*
24   *information that is provided in the reports generated by the surveys. The*
25   *instrument shall be approved by the Senate upon recommendation of*
26   *SERB and the Professional Standards Committee, and may only be*
27   *amended by SERB.*
28
29 SERB is a board specifically appointed for expertise on survey research and contains the
30 AVP for IEA as an advisor. Professional Standards and the Senate may accept or reject
31 the survey instruments provided by SERB, but may not amend the text of the survey
32 instrument.
33
34 In this revision of the instruments, SERB has made several modest changes to the
35 questions in the instrument designed to improve their clarity. A major improvement is the
36 addition of the free-response section to the SOLATE instrument. Giving students the
37 opportunity to go beyond the numerical ratings and write a free response is required by
38 our policy but has inexplicably only been part of the SOTE instrument and not the
39 SOLATE instrument. This will bring our laboratory evaluations into conformity with policy
40 and allow students in lab courses the same opportunity to respond as students in other
41 courses.
42
43 In April this instrument came before the Senate and was referred back to committee for
44 additional work. The motion arose from some disagreement and confusion surrounding a
45 number of "informational questions" that are used to establish the context of the answers
46 provided on opinions of teaching effectiveness. The motion constrained SERB to seek
47 wider consultation on these informational questions but not to otherwise change the draft
48 of the instrument. (From the minutes, Senator Shifflett's motion:)
49
50   "The reason for the constraint is so we don't open up the entire SERB [most
51   probably meant SOTE] again. The changes are good. The notion of context
52   needs to be discussed campus-wide and there needs to be input about whether we
53   want this data as part of the SOTE."

In conformity with this motion, SERB is moving ahead to consult more widely and possibly change the information items. However, SERB also recommends prompt adoption of the rest of the changes (leaving the previous 2004 informational questions unchanged.) This will permit the relatively less controversial improvements to be adopted immediately while allowing SERB ample time for a more careful consultation regarding the information items.

Professional Standards endorses this approach, and reminds the Senate that SERB has worked diligently over the course of two and a half years to amend the existing SOTE and SOLATE survey instrument. The last time the instruments were changed was in 2004

Approved: 10/3/2016
Vote: 8-0-0)

Present: Peter, Green, White, Lee, Reade, Kauppila, Caesar, Hamedi-Hagh

Absent: None

Approved by the Student Evaluation Review Board: 9/23/2016

Vote: 4-0-0

Present: Slusser, Venkatsubrama, Eirinaki, Leisenring

Absent: Strage, Ho, Wright, Lee

Financial Impact: No changes over the previous policy.

Workload Impact: Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics (IEA) will need to update the online questionnaires.

Student Opinion of Laboratory and Activity Teaching Effectiveness (SOLATE) Revision
Proposal to Professional Standards Committee by SERB, September 2016

Note: Text highlighted in red has been revised.

Instructions

This instrument is designed to be a professional evaluation of your instructor's teaching performance. It is NOT designed to measure your reaction to the subject, the facilities (such as the physical conditions of the classroom), or your instructor's physical appearance. Your individual ratings will be anonymous and a summary of items 1-15 will be available to your instructor after grades are turned in. This summary may enhance your instructor's teaching. It will also be used in the evaluation of your instructor for personnel matters such as retention, tenure and promotion. **If the question does not apply to your course, please select "not applicable/no opportunity to observe".**

The lab or activity instructor:

1. Made course requirements clear.
      5. Strongly Agree
      4. Agree
      3. Neutral
      2. Disagree
      1. Strongly Disagree
      Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

2. Used grading criteria that were clear.
      5. Strongly Agree
      4. Agree
      3. Neutral
      2. Disagree
      1. Strongly Disagree
      Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

3. Was well prepared for class or activity.
      5. Strongly Agree
      4. Agree
      3. Neutral
      2. Disagree
      1. Strongly Disagree
      Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

4. Showed concern for student success in the course, and was accessible and responsive to students
      5. Strongly Agree
      4. Agree
      3. Neutral
      2. Disagree
      1. Strongly Disagree
      Not applicable/no opportunity to observe
5. Made the class environment safe for students, including demonstration of the proper use of any equipment and techniques.
      5. Strongly Agree
      4. Agree
      3. Neutral
      2. Disagree
      1. Strongly Disagree
      Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

142
143 6. Helped me integrate the lecture concepts with the class/activity.
144   5. Strongly Agree
145   4. Agree
146   3. Neutral
147   2. Disagree
148   1. Strongly Disagree
149   Not applicable/no opportunity to observe
150
151 7. Increased my understanding of the subject.
152   5. Strongly Agree
153   4. Agree
154   3. Neutral
155   2. Disagree
156   1. Strongly Disagree
157   Not applicable/no opportunity to observe
158
159 8. Stimulated my interest in the subject.
160   5. Strongly Agree
161   4. Agree
162   3. Neutral
163   2. Disagree
164   1. Strongly Disagree
165   Not applicable/no opportunity to observe
166
167 9. Overall, this instructor's teaching was effective.
168   5. Strongly Agree
169   4. Agree
170   3. Neutral
171   2. Disagree
172   1. Strongly Disagree
173   Not applicable/no opportunity to observe
174
175 Please answer the following informational items: *(wording and responses changed only to match current SOTE*
176 *instrument)*
177
178 11. What is your current estimate of your expected overall grade in this course?
179   A
180   B
181   C
182   D or F
183   Other (Credit/No Credit, Incomplete, etc.)
184
185 12. You are a:
186   Freshman
187   Sophomore
188   Junior
189   Senior
190   Graduate Student
191   Credential Only
192   Other (e.g. Open University)
193
194 Free-Response Questions:
195
196 What do you think are the strengths of this instructor's teaching?
197

198 What suggestions, if any, do you have to further improve the instructor's teaching?

199 If you like, please use this space to elaborate on your responses to the multiple choice questions above.

200

201 **Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTE) Revision**
202 Proposal to Professional Standards Committee by SERB, September 2016
203
204 *Note: Text highlighted in red has been revised.*

205 **Instructions**

206 This instrument is designed to be a professional evaluation of your instructor's teaching performance. It is
207 NOT designed to measure your reaction to the subject, the facilities (such as the physical conditions of the
208 classroom), or your instructor's physical appearance. Your individual ratings will be anonymous and a
209 summary of items 1-13 will be available to your instructor after grades are turned in. This summary may
210 enhance your instructor's teaching. It will also be used in the evaluation of your instructor for personnel
211 matters such as retention, tenure and promotion. **If the question does not apply to your course, please**
212 **select "not applicable/no opportunity to observe".**

213 **Multiple Choice Questions**
214
215 The instructor:
216
217 1. Demonstrated relevance of the course content:
218   5. Strongly Agree
219   4. Agree
220   3. Neutral
221   2. Disagree
222   1. Strongly Disagree
223   Not applicable/no opportunity to observe
224
225 2. Used assignments that enhanced learning:
226   5. Strongly Agree
227   4. Agree
228   3. Neutral
229   2. Disagree
230   1. Strongly Disagree
231   Not applicable/no opportunity to observe
232
233 3. Summarized/emphasized important points:
234   5. Strongly Agree
235   4. Agree
236   3. Neutral
237   2. Disagree
238   1. Strongly Disagree
239   Not applicable/no opportunity to observe
240
241 4. Was responsive to questions and comments from students:
242   5. Strongly Agree
243   4. Agree
244   3. Neutral
245   2. Disagree
246   1. Strongly Disagree
247   Not applicable/no opportunity to observe
248 5. Established an atmosphere that facilitated learning:
249   5. Strongly Agree
250   4. Agree
251   3. Neutral
252   2. Disagree
253   1. Strongly Disagree
254   Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

255
256 6. Was approachable for assistance:
257   5. Strongly Agree
258   4. Agree
259   3. Neutral
260   2. Disagree
261   1. Strongly Disagree
262   Not applicable/no opportunity to observe
263
264 7. Was respectful of the diversity of students in this class:
265   5. Strongly Agree
266   4. Agree
267   3. Neutral
268   2. Disagree
269   1. Strongly Disagree
270   Not applicable/no opportunity to observe
271
272 8. Showed strong interest in teaching this class:
273   5. Strongly Agree
274   4. Agree
275   3. Neutral
276   2. Disagree
277   1. Strongly Disagree
278   Not applicable/no opportunity to observe
279
280 9. Used teaching methods that helped students learn important concepts:
281   5. Strongly Agree
282   4. Agree
283   3. Neutral
284   2. Disagree
285   1. Strongly Disagree
286   Not applicable/no opportunity to observe
287
288 10. Used grading criteria that were clear:
289   5. Strongly Agree
290   4. Agree
291   3. Neutral
292   2. Disagree
293   1. Strongly Disagree
294   Not applicable/no opportunity to observe
295
296
297
298
299 11. Helped students analyze complex/abstract ideas:
300   5. Strongly Agree
301   4. Agree
302   3. Neutral
303   2. Disagree
304   1. Strongly Disagree
305   Not applicable/no opportunity to observe
306
307 12. Provided meaningful feedback about student work:
308   5. Strongly Agree
309   4. Agree
310   3. Neutral

7

311   2. Disagree
312   1. Strongly Disagree
313   Not applicable/no opportunity to observe
314
315 13. Overall, this instructor's teaching was effective:
316   5. Strongly Agree
317   4. Agree
318   3. Neutral
319   2. Disagree
320   1. Strongly Disagree
321   Not applicable/no opportunity to observe
322
323 Please answer the following informational items:
324
325 14. What is your current estimate of your expected overall grade in this course?
326   A
327   B
328   C
329   D or F
330   Other (Credit/No Credit, Incomplete, etc.)
331
332 15. You are a:
333   Freshman
334   Sophomore
335   Junior
336   Senior
337   Graduate Student
338   Credential Only
339   Other (e.g. Open University)
340
341 16. Did you complete this form without undue influence from other students?
342   Yes
343   No
344
345 17. Did you complete this form without undue influence from the instructor?
346   Yes
347   No
348
349 **Free-Response Questions:**
350
351 What do you think are the strengths of this instructor's teaching?
352
353 What suggestions, if any, do you have to further improve the instructor's teaching?
354 If you like, please use this space to elaborate on your responses.

Student Opinion of Teaching Effectiveness (SOTE) Revision
Proposal to Professional Standards Committee by SERB, September 2016

Note: Text highlighted in red has been revised.

Instructions

This instrument is designed to be a professional evaluation of your instructor's teaching performance. It is NOT designed to measure your reaction to the subject, the facilities (such as the physical conditions of the classroom), or your instructor's physical appearance. Your individual ratings will be anonymous and a summary of items 1-13 will be available to your instructor after grades are turned in. This summary may enhance your instructor's teaching. It will also be used in the evaluation of your instructor for personnel matters such as retention, tenure and promotion. **If the question does not apply to your course, please select "not applicable/no opportunity to observe".**

| Commented [ES1]: Replaces: "to evaluate" |
| Commented [ES2]: Addition. |
| Commented [ES3]: Addition. |

Multiple Choice Questions

The instructor:

1. Demonstrated relevance of the course content:
    5. Strongly Agree
    4. Agree
    3. Neutral
    2. Disagree
    1. Strongly Disagree
    Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

2. Used assignments that enhanced learning:
    5. Strongly Agree
    4. Agree
    3. Neutral
    2. Disagree
    1. Strongly Disagree
    Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

3. Summarized/emphasized important points:
    5. Strongly Agree
    4. Agree
    3. Neutral
    2. Disagree
    1. Strongly Disagree
    Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

4. Was responsive to questions and comments from students:
    5. Strongly Agree
    4. Agree
    3. Neutral
    2. Disagree
    1. Strongly Disagree
    Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

5. Established an atmosphere that facilitated learning:
       5. Strongly Agree
       4. Agree
       3. Neutral
       2. Disagree
       1. Strongly Disagree
       Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

6. Was approachable for assistance:
       5. Strongly Agree
       4. Agree
       3. Neutral
       2. Disagree
       1. Strongly Disagree
       Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

7. Was respectful of the diversity of students in this class:
       5. Strongly Agree
       4. Agree
       3. Neutral
       2. Disagree
       1. Strongly Disagree
       Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

Commented [ES4]: Replaces: "responsive to"

8. Showed strong interest in teaching this class:
       5. Strongly Agree
       4. Agree
       3. Neutral
       2. Disagree
       1. Strongly Disagree
       Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

9. Used teaching methods that helped students learn important concepts:
       5. Strongly Agree
       4. Agree
       3. Neutral
       2. Disagree
       1. Strongly Disagree
       Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

Commented [ES5]: Replaces: "Used intellectually challenging teaching methods."

10. Used grading criteria that were clear:
       5. Strongly Agree
       4. Agree
       3. Neutral
       2. Disagree
       1. Strongly Disagree
       Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

Commented [ES6]: Replaces: "Used fair grading methods."

11. Helped students analyze complex/abstract ideas:
    5. Strongly Agree
    4. Agree
    3. Neutral
    2. Disagree
    1. Strongly Disagree
    Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

12. Provided meaningful feedback about student work:
    5. Strongly Agree
    4. Agree
    3. Neutral
    2. Disagree
    1. Strongly Disagree
    Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

13. Overall, this instructor's teaching was effective:
    5. Strongly Agree
    4. Agree
    3. Neutral
    2. Disagree
    1. Strongly Disagree
    Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

Please answer the following informational items:

14. What is your current estimate of your expected overall grade in this course?
    A
    B
    C
    D or F
    Other (Credit/No Credit, Incomplete, etc.)

15. You are a:
    Freshman
    Sophomore
    Junior
    Senior
    Graduate Student
    Credential Only
    Other (e.g. Open University)

16. Did you complete this form without undue influence from other students?
    Yes
    No

17. Did you complete this form without undue influence from the instructor?
    Yes
    No

Free-Response Questions:

What do you think are the strengths of this instructor's teaching?

What suggestions, if any, do you have to further improve the instructor's teaching?

If you like, please use this space to elaborate on your responses.

Student Opinion of Laboratory and Activity Teaching Effectiveness (SOLATE) Revision
Proposal to Professional Standards Committee by SERB, September 2016

Note: Text highlighted in red has been revised.

Instructions

This instrument is designed to be a professional evaluation of your instructor's teaching performance. It is NOT designed to measure your reaction to the subject, the facilities (such as the physical conditions of the classroom), or your instructor's physical appearance. Your individual ratings will be anonymous and a summary of items 1-15 will be available to your instructor after grades are turned in. This summary may enhance your instructor's teaching. It will also be used in the evaluation of your instructor for personnel matters such as retention, tenure and promotion. **If the question does not apply to your course, please select "not applicable/no opportunity to observe".**

The lab or activity instructor:

1. Made course requirements clear.
    5. Strongly Agree
    4. Agree
    3. Neutral
    2. Disagree
    1. Strongly Disagree
    Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

2. Used grading criteria that were clear.
    5. Strongly Agree
    4. Agree
    3. Neutral
    2. Disagree
    1. Strongly Disagree
    Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

3. Was well prepared for class or activity.
    5. Strongly Agree
    4. Agree
    3. Neutral
    2. Disagree
    1. Strongly Disagree
    Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

4. Showed concern for student success in the course, and was accessible and responsive to students.
    5. Strongly Agree
    4. Agree
    3. Neutral
    2. Disagree
    1. Strongly Disagree
    Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

5. Made the class environment safe for students, including demonstration of the proper use of any equipment and techniques.
     5. Strongly Agree
     4. Agree
     3. Neutral
     2. Disagree
     1. Strongly Disagree
     Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

6. Helped me integrate the lecture concepts with the class/activity.
     5. Strongly Agree
     4. Agree
     3. Neutral
     2. Disagree
     1. Strongly Disagree
     Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

7. Increased my understanding of the subject.
     5. Strongly Agree
     4. Agree
     3. Neutral
     2. Disagree
     1. Strongly Disagree
     Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

8. Stimulated my interest in the subject.
     5. Strongly Agree
     4. Agree
     3. Neutral
     2. Disagree
     1. Strongly Disagree
     Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

9. Overall, this instructor's teaching was effective.
     5. Strongly Agree
     4. Agree
     3. Neutral
     2. Disagree
     1. Strongly Disagree
     Not applicable/no opportunity to observe

Please answer the following informational items: *(wording and responses changed only to match current SOTE instrument)*

11. What is your current estimate of your expected overall grade in this course?
     A
     B
     C
     D or F
     Other (Credit/No Credit, Incomplete, etc.)

Commented [ES8]: Addition.

Commented [ES9]: Replaces: "Helped me apply theory or concept to class activity."

Commented [ES10]: Replaces: "Helped me learn material."

Commented [ES11]: Modified response format. Previously:

The overall effectiveness of this instructor is:
A. Excellent
B. Above Average
C. Average
D. Below Average
E. Far Below Average
NA. Not applicable or no opportunity to observe

Commented [ES12]: Replaces: Based on mid-term exams, projects, and graded assignments to date, what is your current grade in the course?

12. You are a:
    Freshman
    Sophomore
    Junior
    Senior
    Graduate Student
    Credential Only
    Other (e.g. Open University)

Free-Response Questions:

What do you think are the strengths of this instructor's teaching?

What suggestions, if any, do you have to further improve the instructor's teaching?

If you like, please use this space to elaborate on your responses to the multiple choice questions above.

1 **San Jose State University**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Organization and Government Committee**   **AS 1634**
4 **October 24, 2016**
5 **First Reading**
6
7 # Constitutional Amendment
8 ## Modification of Senate Constitution Related to Membership
9
10 Legislative History: Modifies article II, section 2 of the constitution of the Academic
11 Senate. The amendment would remove from the representatives of the administration
12 the position of Vice President for Advancement and add the chief diversity officer.
13
14 Whereas: Periodic examination of the needs of the senate for robust collaboration
15   and communication with the administration along with the changing roles
16   and responsibilities of administrative positions over time are important,
17   and
18
19 Whereas: A new chief diversity officer for SJSU has been appointed, and
20
21 Whereas: Opportunities to connect with and receive information from the Vice
22   President for Advancement can be achieved without the necessity of a
23   designated seat on the Senate, therefore be it
24
25 Resolved   That article II, section 2 of the Senate's constitution be modified as
26   follows:
27
28 Article II, Section 2. Administration representatives shall consist of the President, the
29 Provost, the Vice President for Administration and Finance, ~~Vice President for~~
30 ~~Advancement~~, the Vice President for Student Affairs, and Chief Diversity Officer, ex
31 officio; and four (4) academic deans, at least two of whom shall be deans of colleges,
32 elected by the academic deans for staggered two-year terms.
33
34
35 Rationale: This modification is recommended in light of the demands on the time of the
36 Vice President for Advancement being predominantly external. The linkage for the
37 Senate to the person in this position may be best achieved through targeted
38 communication and reporting to the Senate and Executive Committee. In addition, the
39 senate and the new chief diversity officer will benefit significantly from direct
40 participation of the person in this role with the Senate.
41
42 Approved: 12-0-0
43 Date: 10/17/16
44 Present: Laker, Curry, Shifflett, Rajkovic, Higgins, Ormsbee, Boekema, Bailey,
45 Grosvenor, Hart, Tran, Bailey
46 Absent: None
47 Financial Impact: None expected
48 Workload Impact: No change from current situation.

6

7 # Amendment A to University Policy S16-8
8 # Selection and Review of Administrators

9

10 Legislative History: Modifies S16-8 which pertains to the selection and review of
11 administrators by providing flexibility in the appointment of review/selection committee
12 members.

13

14 Whereas: Some flexibility in the constitution of committees for the selection and
15   review of administrators could help in fitting the membership to the
16   position under review/selection, and

17

18 Whereas: Existing policy applies one model to the membership of all selection and
19   review committees, therefore be it

20

21 Resolved   That section 1.3 (composition of search committees) of S16-8 be modified
22   as follows:

23

24 1.3 Committees shall be large enough to allow for sufficiently broad representation, yet
25 small enough so as not to be unwieldy. When feasible, an odd number of voting
26 members will be appointed to eliminate the possibility of tied
27 votes. **Faculty, administrators and staff shall be represented. Students should be**
28 **represented as appropriate depending on the administrative position.**
29 Consideration should be given to representation of the diversity of the campus. Regular
30 (tenured and tenure-track) faculty shall comprise a majority on all search committees for
31 administrators in the academic affairs division and at least one-third of other
32 committees. If appropriate, alumni and community representatives may serve on search
33 committees.

34

35 Rationale: This modification will permit some flexibility in the formation of search and
36 review committees in a way that enables the committees to be tailored to the particular
37 position up for review or selection.

38

39 Approved: 10/3/16
40 Vote: 6-0-1
41 Present: Curry, Bailey, Shifflett, Rajkovic, Higgins, Boekema, Boylan-Ashraf
42 Absent: Grosvenor, Laker, Ormsbee, Hart
43 Financial Impact: None expected
44 Workload Impact: No change from current situation.