SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE
2015/2016
Agenda
November 2, 2015, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm
Engineering 285/287

I. **Call to Order and Roll Call** –

II. **Approval of Minutes** –
   Senate Minutes of October 5, 2015

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

IV. **State of the University Announcements:**
   A. 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

V. **Executive Committee Report**
   A. Minutes of the Executive Committee –
      Exec. Minutes of September 28, 2015
      Exec. Minutes of October 12, 2015

   B. Consent Calendar –

   C. Executive Committee Action Items –

VI. **Unfinished Business** –

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

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

   B.   Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
         AS 1582, Policy Recommendation, Academic Integrity (Final Reading)

         AS 1589, Policy Recommendation, Attendance and Participation (First Reading)

   C.   Professional Standards Committee (PS):

D.   Organization and Government Committee (O&G):

AS 1591, Senate Mnagement Resolution, Amend Senate Standing Rule: Senate Meeting Agenda (Final Reading)

AS 1592, Senate Management Resolution, Modification of Graduate Studies and Research Committee Membership (Final Reading)

AS 1586, Policy Recommendation, Modification of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board Membership (Final Reading)

AS 1587, Senate Management Resolution, Dissolving the Heritage, Preservation, and Public History Committee (Final Reading)

AS 1579, Policy Recommendation, Budget Advisory Committee (Final Reading)

AS 1585, Policy Recommendation, Updating the Board of General Studies Membership, Charge, and Responsibilities (Final Reading)

AS 1590, Senate Management Resolution, Remote Attendance at Senate and Committee Meetings (First Reading)

E.   University Library Board (ULB):

VIII.   Special Committee Reports:
University Budget Update by Interim AVP of Administration and Finance, Josee Larochelle, <u>Time Certain: 2:30 p.m.</u>

IX.   New Business:

X.   Adjournment:

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

2015/2016 Academic Senate

MINUTES
October 5, 2015

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

Ex Officio:
  Present: Kimbarow, Sabalius, Amante, Van Selst, Lee
  Absent: Heiden

Administrative Representatives:
  Present: Martin, Blaylock
  Absent: Feinstein, Larochelle, Lanning

Deans:
  Present: Green, Hsu, Steele, Stacks

Students:
  Present: El-Miaari, Abukhdeir, Romero, Medrano, Cuellar, Gay

Alumni Representative:
  Present: Walters

Emeritus Representative:
  Present: Buzanski

General Unit Representatives:
  Present: Matoush, Medina
  Absent: Kauppila

CASA Representatives:
  Present: Schultz-Krohn, Lee, Shifflett, Sen
  Absent: Grosvenor

COB Representatives:
  Present: Sibley, Virick
  Absent: Campsey

EDUC Representatives:
  Present: Mathur, Laker

ENGR Representatives:
  Present: Backer, Sullivan-Green

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

SCI Representatives:
  Present: Kaufman, White, Beyersdorf, Clements

SOS Representatives:
  Present: Peter, Coopman, Curry, Wilson

II. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–**
The minutes of September 14, 2015 were approved as amended (41-0-2).

III. **Communications and Questions –**
  A. From the Chair of the Senate:
    The search committee for the Vice President of Administration and Finance has been appointed by President Martin. The three faculty representatives on the committee include Chair Kimbarow, Senator James Lee, and Assistant Professor Robi Ragan.
    The plan for the search is to bring the finalists to the campus sometime in March after the new President has been designated by the Board of Trustees. The same will be true for the Chief Diversity Officer search. That search committee is being led by Vice President Reggie Blaylock. The finalists from both of these searches will be here in March and the new President will then make the final selection.

The review committee for AVP Maureen Scharberg's five-year review will be selected by the Executive Committee on Monday, October 12, 2015. Chair Kimbarow thanked everyone that nominated themselves. The deadline for nominations is Wednesday, October 7, 2015, close of business.

Kell Fujimoto recently resigned as a representative from the General Unit. Despite numerous emails to the General Unit and General Unit Senators, we were unable to get anyone to run for the seat in the recent special election. Thus, the seat will remain vacant, unless someone steps forward to fill the seat, through the end of the academic year.

We were also unsuccessful in getting anyone to step forward to be the faculty representative on the Campus Fee Advisory Committee (CFAC) for one year. This committee is chaired by Interim Vice President Josee Larochelle. The primary purpose of CFAC is to review and approve any new student fees, but also to evaluate one-time funding proposals for SSETF funding. It is an important committee, but only meets about twice a semester.

The Presidential Selection Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees meets next week with the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees. The entire group will be present at the open forum from 10:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m., October 15, 2015, in Morris Daily Auditorium.

Chair Kimbarow announced he could not stress enough how important it is for all of us to attend the open forum to inform the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees about the qualities we think are important in a President. The Chair of the Presidential Search Committee, Trustee Rebecca Eisen, met with faculty members of the Executive Committee about 1 ½ weeks ago. Trustee Eisen stressed that the open forum is a critical opportunity for the campus to weigh in on how that search will proceed. Please take advantage of the opportunity to come to the open forum. You can provide feedback online. Also, please contact your constituents and get their feedback before the forum. The forum will be taped and will be available to the search committee.

Chair Kimbarow announced that he and the Senate Administrator are continually looking for ways to optimize the Senate experience for everyone. The two of us are looking into a new Public Address system that may meet our need for speakers and wireless microphones, and we are also working on acquiring clickers and clicker technology. It will take a little while to work some of these things in, but we are working on it.

Interim President Martin will host the Academic Senate at the President's house for the annual Senate Holiday Party on Sunday, December 6, 2015 from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m.

B. **From the President of the University** –
   Interim President Martin announced that the entire campus had been very welcoming. The President visited Moss Landing Marine Lab on Friday and thought it was amazing. "You can reach out and touch the whales!"

   Interim President Martin announced some of the cabinet members were absent due to fund raising events.

Chair Kimbarow presented a motion to suspend standing rule 7a for Academic Year 2015-2016 in order to allow the Executive Committee to set the Senate agenda in the best order for each Senate meeting. Chair Kimbarow informed the Senate that a 2/3^{rds} vote was needed to suspend the standing rule. The Senate voted and motion passed (43-0-0).

IV.   State of the University Announcements. Questions. In rotation.
   A. Provost – No report.

   B. Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF) – No report.

   C. Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA) –
   Applications for Fall 2016 were accepted starting October 1, 2015, and the last day applications can be accepted is November 30, 2015. The first application came in at 12:06 a.m. and that person will get a sweatshirt. About 60,000 applications are expected for next Fall's class. The CSU anticipates approximately 700,000 to 800,000 applications throughout the 23 CSU campuses.

   The Student Services Center (SSC) is hosting an open house with refreshments for faculty, students, staff, and members of the community. Come learn what services are offered in the SSC. The open house will be on October 15, 2015 from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m.

   This past week Student Affairs had two career fairs; one for technology and one for business.

   Homecoming is less than two weeks away. Student Affairs will host several events including Tailgate Takeover Two (TTT) with free refreshments and food, and "Fire on the Fountain" held the Thursday prior to Homecoming.

   D. Associated Students President (AS):
   AS President Amante reported that next week is Legacy week and will begin with the unveiling of the "Peace Pole." The next event is the Student Town Hall meeting which will also be attended by the Student Trustee Kelsey Brewer on October 14, 2015.

   AS has established a Student Hunger Committee. AS conducted a survey in which 1/3rd of SJSU students reported having to chose between eating and paying their living expenses. AS has worked hard to setup places around campus that students can go to get food assistance including the Health Center, Housing, the College of Science Advising Center, the Business Student Success Center, etc. Food insecurity is a major issue for students on this campus and AS is committed to helping those in need.

   At a recent "Meet the President" event, there were student protesters that were

protesting inaccessibility for undocumented students. AS supports this effort.

E. Vice President for University Advancement (VPUA): No report.

F. CSU Statewide Senators:
Senator James Lee reported that four CSU campuses are currently searching for a new president and they include San José State, Sonoma State, Chico State, and Channel Islands. All of these searches are closed searches. Resolutions are being considered by many campuses asking for open visits to campuses during presidential searches. If the CSU continues with closed searches, then the CSU Statewide Senate will consider asking for the addition of more faculty to the faculty representatives on the Presidential Selection Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees.

Questions:
Q: Did the CSU Statewide Senate discuss a resolution requesting an increase in the faculty and student representatives to the Presidential Selection Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees?
A: Yes. However, there is a resolution being considered asking for the addition of an Emeritus Faculty Trustee and there is current debate as to whether ASCSU wants to ask for two Faculty Trustees or a Faculty Trustee and an Emeritus Trustee since it is highly unlikely the Governor would approve both.
Q: Can you explain the Presidential Selection process?
A: The Presidential Selection Committee consists of the Chancellor and four Trustees. The Presidential Selection Advisory Committee to the Board of Trustees will recommend three finalists to the Presidential Selection Committee.

On December 2, 2015, the Presidential Selection Advisory Committee will review the paperwork from all candidates and narrow the selection down to eight semi-finalists. On January 15 & 16, 2016 the committee will interview the eight semi-finalists and narrow the selection down to three to four finalists. These three or four finalists will be provided to the Presidential Selection Committee which will make interview the finalists on January 22,2016 the final selection by the end of February or beginning of March 2016.

V.   Executive Committee Report –
   A. Executive Committee Minutes –
      Exec. Minutes of August 31, 2015 – No questions.
      Exec. Minutes of September 21, 2015 – No questions.

   B. Consent Calendar –
      Senator Stacks inquired as to why so many members were being removed from the Heritage, Preservation, and Public History Committee. Associate Vice Chair (AVC) Backer responded that there is a resolution from the Organization and Government Committee before the Senate today asking to disband this committee.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the consent calendar. **The Senate voted and the consent calendar of October 5, 2015 was approved (43-0-0)**.

    C. Executive Committee Action Items:
A motion was made and seconded to approve the Election Calendar of 2016. **The Senate voted and the Election Calendar for 2016 was approved (43-0-0).**

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 1581, Policy Recommendation, Instructor Drops in Online Courses (Final Reading).*

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to change line 31 from, "... Logging on to the LMS the first day of the class or informing …." to read, "Logging on to the LMS the official first day of instruction or informing …." and to change line 34 from, "after the official class start date." to read, "after the official first day of instruction." The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the amendment failed (14-21-8).

Senator Kaufman presented an amendment to change line 31 to read, "…the LMS shell for the class on the first day of the class …." Senator White presented an amendment to the Kaufman amendment that was friendly to change it to read, "… the LMS class shell on the first scheduled day of the class …." The amendment was seconded. **The Senate voted and the Kaufman/White amendment passed (39-3-1)**.

Senator Van Selst presented a motion to return to committee. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the motion failed (7-33-3).

Senator Sabalius presented an amendment that was friendly to change the word "within" in lines 29 and 34 to "before."

Senator Kaufman called the question on debate. The Senate voted and the motion passed (43-0-0).

The Senate voted on AS 1581 as amended and the resolution passed (40-3-0).

Senator Kaufman presented *AS 1582, Policy Recommendation, Academic Integrity (First Reading).*
The existing policy is not in compliance with several Executive Orders (EO) including 1037 and 1098. This policy creates an appeals process for students.

Questions:
Q: How many years have we been out of compliance? What happens if we don't pass this resolution?

A: Good question. I don't know the answer.

Q: On section 5.3 and 5.4, why not just to be clean say either the alleged violation is upheld or it is not?
A: The issue here is one of fairness and equity. One faculty member should not be giving much harsher sanctions than another for the same type violation. That is the goal with that.

B. Professional Standards Committee (PS) –

C. **Organization and Government Committee (O&G) –**
Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1584, Policy Recommendation, Rescinding Outdated Policy (S98-11), Related to the 1998 GE Guidelines (Final Reading).* Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to add "9-28-15" to line 34 and "8-0-0" to line 35. **The Senate voted and AS 1584 passed (43-0-0).**

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1578, Policy Recommendation, Strategic Planning Policy (First Reading).*
Questions:
Q: Would the committee consider adding an Undergraduate Student seat?
A: The committee will consider it.

Q: It seems with every new administration there is another strategic plan, could there be some guidance about how frequently this process should be done?
A: The range should be 5-7 years.

Q: Why is there only two or three faculty on the committee out of 15 people?
A: The Senate Chair, a faculty-at-large member, and a Department Chair are on the committee. O&G tried very hard not to get back to 22 people on the committee which made it impossible to schedule meetings in the past.

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1579, Policy Recommendation, Budget Advisory Committee (First Reading).*
This policy would be in effect until O&G can bring the final Strategic Planning Policy back in Spring 2016. In the meantime, the campus needs a Budget Advisory Committee as a resource for the administration as well as the campus.

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1551, Modification of Writing Requirements Committee Membership (Final Reading).*
The Senate voted and AS 1551 was approved (43-0-0).

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1585, Policy Recommendation, Updating the Board of General Studies Membership and Charge (First Reading).*

Questions:

Q: Line 67 says "Section moved here during 9/21/15 meeting."
A: That is an error. A section should have been moved and will be fixed for the final reading.

Q: Has the committee considered that the structure of BOGS may not be well suited to the change in its mission where American Institutions (AI) is being added to its charge? Namely, the AI courses in U.S. Government and U.S. History are not general education courses, they are highly specialized. Normally one would expect people trained in those disciplines to evaluate those courses. If AI is going to be added to BOGS charge there needs to be some structural change to BOGS.
A: O&G will consider this.

Q: Lines 188-193 talk about how BOGS will develop and implement values for the evaluation of core competencies, information literacy, written communication, oral communication, critical thinking, and quantitative reasoning. Those are not necessarily aligned with any specific GE category other than written and oral communication, so can you tell us how BOGS will implement strategy and whether those core competencies are a critical part of GE or GE and upper division courses?
A: The discussion goes like this, where do you place the responsibility for developing and proposing information strategies? These are core competencies and are built into our GE program at lower and upper division levels. BOGS is a logical place to put this charge. Now, what are they going to do? When we talked to the Director of Assessment and the AVP of Graduate and Undergraduate Programs, and the Chair of BOGS, they were willing to get information for us about how we might do this. We already have some things in place and WASC gave us a thumbs up for doing such a good job on information literacy. This will take time.

Q: My understanding is that to keep within the 120 units some areas had to give and AI was one of the areas. Have you considered the possibility of removing the AI responsibility from BOGS?
A: Yes, and we are unable to do so. The Senate already approved the 2014 GE Guidelines. However, it is clear we need to revisit the membership of BOGS.

Q: Can you also consult with C&R Committee?
A: Yes.

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

E. **Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) –**
Senator Mathur presented *AS 1580, Policy Recommendation, Credit by Exam (Final Reading).* **The Senate voted and AS 1580 passed (43-0-0).**

Senator Mathur presented *AS 1583, Policy Recommendation, Internships and Service Learning (First Reading).*
In 2011, the Chancellor's Office created EO 1064 which requires all CSU campuses to setup a policy and guidelines for all internships. Internships are defined in the EO as off-

campus activity designed to serve educational purposes by offering experience in a service-learning business, non-profit, or government setting. C&R consulted widely on this policy and has worked on it for the past year.

Questions:
Q: There was one dissenting vote, can you tell me why?
A: That person wanted to wait two additional days and do an online vote in order to get more feedback from his/her college.

Q: In the second Resolved, I get the impression all the departments will be able to setup their own participation guidelines. Am I reading this correctly?
A: Yes.

Q: Is there a difference for paid and unpaid internships in the requirements?
A: If the internship is required for the course, then EO 1064 applies to it.

Q: Will an attempt be made to actually calculate the financial impact?
A: C&R can try but there are a number of variables it depends on, so it would be difficult to put a dollar amount in there.

Q: Would the university consider purchasing liability insurance for smaller companies so that they are not forced out of student internships? Given that there is already an UOA and no policy, what is the purpose of a policy?
A: EO 1064 requires us to have a policy. This provides protection for the student from being sued by the company.

Q: There is a sentence in the UOA that specifies the general liability insurance of $1 million to $2 million dollars and some companies would not like this aspect of the UOA. Why is this million statement included in the UOA?
A: $1 million dollars represents about a $350 insurance premium per year. This is the minimum that is required - even for non-profits it is a very basic premium coverage amount. Most of the larger companies have much higher liability insurance coverage.
Q: What is the university going to do if major companies like Cisco refuse to sign the UOA? Cisco and Price Waterhouse have already said they will not.
A: C&R will consult with the College of Business directly. C&R did not get that feedback.

VIII. **Special Committee Reports –**
Academic Affairs Division Budget Report by the AVP of Academic Budgets and Planning, Marna Genes.

AVP Genes reported that the Academic Affairs Division received about $9 million in new funding this year. Of that $9 million, $4.2 million was for compensation adjustments. This included the campus-based equity program that amounted to approximately $600,000. The Division also received $4 million for enrollment growth at $5,100 per full-time equivalent student (FTES).

Other adjustments include some miscellaneous categories such as funding given to Kinesiology for using the Event Center for some of their courses. Because the Event Center is funded by Student Union fees, they are reimbursed for this instructional use.

The college of Business also received a $350,000 adjustment. When the new budget model was put into effect last year, the college of Business was the only college to suffer a budget reduction on a per student basis. The budget model does not fully address the costs associated with AACSB accreditation. Business suffered a 7% reduction, but we fixed that this year. The college of Science also received a $50,000 swap to replace CERF money. In addition, $770,000 went to the division account which included about $500,000 needed to cover a deficit created last year when the division funded the new budget model.

Questions:
Q: It was my understanding that the colleges should have received an 8% increase this year, but when I apply that 8% to the budgets most colleges lost money while some increased a lot.
A: The 8% increase includes compensation adjustment funding (3.7%). The compensation adjustments are tied to specific people, so they are what they are. Enrollment funding (3.5%) follows FTES. Last year we began using the Induced Course Load Matrix (ICLM) model for enrollment funding. ICLM uses three years of historical course-taking behavior to predict the course enrollment patterns of the current student body. ICLM tells us how many FTES each college needs to teach their students and everyone else's students that take their classes.

Q: One of the concerns over the last couple of years in my department is that we get refugees from other colleges. When taking in these refugees, we are actually harming ourselves because we could have admitted higher quality better prepared students. Instead, we are spending additional resources training these refugees up. This ends up being costly for us.
A: This is a valid concern. It is something we will have to talk about in enrollment planning circles.

The next slide is a breakdown of the increased FTES to colleges. You will see that the breakdown is two-thirds non-resident and one-third resident students. The financial penalty for being overenrolled has been withdrawn by the Chancellor's Office. However, the Chancellor has asked Presidents to stay within 3.5% over enrollment.

The college of Business has been overenrolled for years and they are trying to encourage four-year graduation rates. In order to do so, we are going to have to increase their ICLM for this effect.

SSETF (Student Success, Excellence & Technology Fee) started in Fall 2012. It subsumed two fees including IRA (Instructionally Related Activities) fees and course fees. Then in Fall 2014, we unbundled our student success fee and reduced it. Now we have SSETF-Student Success fees, SSETF-Course Support fees, and SSETF IRA fees. The course support fee is $31 per term and is now being managed locally in the Academic Affairs Division. When SSETF was implemented, the Senate and UCCD wanted the course fee distributed to the colleges with some basis for enrollment and inflation. Academic Affairs has done this. The colleges this year received adjustments based on enrollment levels and an inflation adjustment.

Questions:

Q: What about courses that are lab-based since we don't have lab fees any longer? How are funds allocated for these lab-based courses?
A: The only growth in SSETF-Course Support revenues will come from enrollment growth and inflation adjustments; these will be small. It will be a big challenge to fund course support needs from SSETF. We are looking to other sources, like the Operating Fund. First, we need to determine what the needs are. SJSU has been through many years of budget uncertainties, so we don't have a good reference in history for adequate course support levels. We will be consulting widely with people on FTES models we can use, and also using one-time funding to replace large equipment that is obsolete or at end-of-life.

Q: You said the ICLM predicts the FTES needed based on past behavior, but needed for what?
A: It isn't based on demand for specific courses, because we do not use wait-list data in ICLM. Instead it is based on the students successful in getting into classes.
Q: The only way to know that a student will take a certain Economics or Business course is based on previous behavior, so then FTES is being calculated strictly on the basis of past student demand. Then where do the non-demand factors such as resource effectiveness, interdependence, contribution to the academic field, and alternative forms of instruction fit in to this budget model?
A: They are reflected in the actions of the colleges and the decisions they make about course offerings within the college.

Q: Are the dollars per FTES different per college?
A: Yes.
Q: Is the amount given different based on whether the student is undergraduate or graduate?
A: Not in the dollar amount given, but FTES are weighted for graduate students, so there is a differential funding level.

Q: What is the difference between goal FTES and target FTES?
A: Target FTES represents two things. For resident students the target FTES is set by the Chancellor's Office. We have no control over that number. When it comes to non-resident students, the target and the goals are not set by the Chancellor's Office. The target is the number we think we can safely achieve, and the goal is the additional enrollment we think we can achieve. The goal FTES is everything that is over our target FTES.

Q: We have seven colleges and their budgets range from the lowest budget of $8.5 million to the largest budget for the College of Science at almost $20 million. The Athletics budget is about three times larger than the College of Education's budget, two times larger than the College of Business budget, and 20% larger than the College of Science budget. Two-thirds of that money is subsidies that go to Athletics to the tune of $15-$17 million. This would fund another large college. How does Academic Affairs feel about this and is there anything you can do about it?
A: Point of order, we haven't even been given the Athletics budget for this year yet.

Q: I am using last year's budget of $24 million for Athletics, and previous years budgets were always over $20 million. I doubt that these numbers will have changed that drastically this year.
A: I have to say that the Provost is a member of the cabinet and has a voice at the table. I'm sure he has expressed any concerns to the group. I believe we have to respect the decisions made by the campus leadership.

Q: Your document states non-resident enrollment does not impact our resident enrollment levels. When I am handing out add codes, I don't ask if a student is resident or non-resident, so how can you say it doesn't impact resident enrollment?
A: I definitely sympathize with the faculty who face this situation. The problem is that we have an imbalance in the headcount of students versus the FTES target. I think we have too many headcount students right now. In the long run it will be very important to improve our graduation rates. It is a two-step process. We need to admit the right number of students so that our student body is in balance with our FTES target, but we also need to address bottleneck courses. These are issues we are thinking about and need to address.

Q: For non-resident students my college, the College of Social Sciences, was allocated 4 FTES and the College of Engineering was allocated 417, why?
A: It has to do with the fact that a lot of our non-resident students are Engineering Graduate students.

IX. New Business – None

X. Adjournment – The meeting adjourned at 4:57 p.m.

Executive Committee Meeting Minutes
ADM 167, Noon to 1:30 p.m.
September 28, 2015

Present: Kimbarow, Peter, Martin, Frazier, Lanning, Shifflett, Heiden, Kaufman,
                Larochelle, Blaylock (12:11), Amante (12:20), Mathur, Lee, Backer

Absent: Feinstein

1.   A motion was made and seconded to approve the Executive Committee minutes of
        September 21, 2015 as amended. The committee voted and the minutes were
        approved (13-0-1).

2.   A motion was made and seconded to approve the consent calendar as amended. The
        committee voted and the consent calendar was approved (14-0-0).

3.   A motion was made and seconded to approve the Election Calendar for 2016 as
        amended. The committee voted and the Election Calendar was approved (14-0-0).

4.   Trustee Rebecca Eisen was on campus and met with faculty, students, and
        administrators to discuss what qualities the campus would like to see in a new president.
        Several committee members that met with Trustee Eisen felt the Board of Trustees was
        very interested in the opinion of the Presidential Search Advisory Committee. Chair
        Kimbarow will send a message to the faculty about the Chancellor's open forum on
        October 15, 2015.

5.   The committee discussed a possible Sense of the Senate Resolution asking for
        additional faculty and student representation on the Presidential Search Advisory
        Committee. Chair Kimbarow will solicit input from the Executive Committee via email.

6.   Senate Standing Rule 7 specifies the format of the Senate Agenda. A two-thirds vote of
        the Senate is required to suspend a standing rule. The Executive Committee sets the
        agenda and has voted several times in the past few months to rearrange the agenda to
        allow for announcements from the administration early in the meeting. However, if the
        Executive Committee wants to permanently change the agenda, then a Senate
        Management Resolution needs to be brought to the Senate to modify the Standing Rule.
        Chair Kimbarow will ask the Senate to approve the suspension of Standing Rule 7 for
        the rest of this year's Senate meetings to allow the Organization and Government
        Committee (O&G) time to work on modifying the standing rule.

7.   **Updates**:

        a. **From the President:**

            The procedure for requesting the award of Honorary degrees has changed. A
            campus President may recommend two people for an Honorary degree each
            year, and the recommendations are due on November 30, 2015.

            The President must establish a committee that will review the records and
            materials and make recommendations to the President. The President will then

select up to two nominees. The President asked for suggestions on the number of faculty that should serve on the committee.

The old process called for consultation between the President and the Executive Committee. The new procedure does not include the Executive Committee. Several committee members expressed concern that there should be consultation with individuals that have historical knowledge of the campus and community during the selection process. Chair Kimbarow and President Martin will discuss this further and bring back suggestions to the next Executive Committee meeting on October 12, 2015.

b.   **From the Provost:** No report.

c.   **From the Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA):**

VP Blaylock announced there will be a Family and Community Conference on October 24, 2015 from 8 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. in the Student Union Ballroom.

SJSU will be open for Fall 2016 Admissions on October 1, 2015. The first person to apply will receive a special letter and a free sweatshirt.

d.   **From the Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF):** No report.

e.   **From the Vice President for University Advancement (VPUA):**

The university will have two naming opportunities in the near future.

f.   **From the University Library Board (ULB):**

Past Chair Heiden announced the Heritage, Preservation and Public History Committee wants to disband. O&G will be bringing a resolution to the Senate in the near future.

g.   **From the Associated Students President (AS):**

The Peace Pole will be unveiled sometime between October 12th and October 16th.

AS President Amante and President Martin will be dishing out ice cream to students on October 5, 2015 from 12:30 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Student Trustee Kelsey Brewer will be on campus on October 14, 2015 for a Town Hall meeting.

AS has been heavily involved in lobbying for an extension to the federal Perkins loan. AS will know if the proposed extension is passed by September 30, 2015.

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

These minutes were taken and transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on September 28, 2015. They were edited by Chair Kimbarow on September 30, 2015. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on October 12, 2015.   .

Executive Committee Meeting Minutes
ADM 167, Noon to 2:30 p.m.
October 12, 2015

Present: Kimbarow, Peter, Martin, Frazier, Lanning, Shifflett, Heiden, Kaufman,
              Larochelle, Blaylock, Amante (12:09), Mathur, Lee, Backer, Feinstein

Absent: None

1.   A motion was made and seconded to approve the Executive Committee minutes of
      September 28, 2015 as amended. The committee voted and the minutes were
      approved (14-0-0).

2.   A motion was made and seconded to approve the consent calendar of October 12,
      2015. The committee voted and the consent calendar was approved (14-0-0).

3.   **Updates**:

      a. **From the President:**

         On campus housing is full at 106% of occupancy with 3,370 occupants. The
         second phase of the housing construction will begin next Fall and will result in an
         additional 820 housing units. However, some old units will be torn down and the
         net result will be a total of 3,808 units that, when full, would bring us to 102%
         occupancy.

         Fundraising is one of highest priorities and concerns for SJSU at this time.

         Our five-year capital plan includes both the DMH and Science buildings.

         President Martin met with the San José Mercury News this morning in an effort to
         foster communication between the university and the community.

      b. **From the Provost:**

         The Provost will be working on addressing the heating and air conditioning
         issues in DMH. If the classrooms become too hot on any given day, classes will
         be moved to other buildings. The Provost is looking at long-term solutions.

         The Provost will be setting up a search committee to replace Dean Kifer who will
         be retiring. A retirement event will be scheduled during Spring 2016.

         Several on-board programs have been established for new faculty including
         University 101 led by Dennis Jaehne.

         Provost Feinstein was very pleased with the feedback he received on the
         Academic Affairs Budget Presentation to the Senate by AVP Marna Genes.

         Testing of electronic dossier software should conclude in early Spring 2016 and
         Faculty should be able to use the new software next year.

c. **From the Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA):**

VP Blaylock announced the Student Services Center (SSC) open house will be held on October 15, 2015 from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. in the SSC.

The pilot "take a professor to coffee" program begins next week. Emails will be sent to sophomores encouraging them to apply for one of the 250 $12 VIP Gold Cards to take a professor to coffee/lunch. Sophomores can go to the Center for Faculty Development to register for the program and receive their card. Student Affairs hopes to eventually expand the program to 100 VIP Gold Cards per college.

Service Day is October 13, 2015 and volunteers from the university will be helping throughout the local community.

There are a number of upcoming Homecoming Week events including the Fire on the Fountain on October 15, 2015 from 4 p.m. to 9 p.m. on Tower Lawn.

"Sammy's Bash" will be held on October 16, 2015 from 5 p.m. to 9 p.m. in San Pedro Square.

The Tailgate Takeover II will be held from 5 p.m. – 7 p.m. on October 17, 2015 at Spartan Stadium followed by the Homecoming game against San Diego State University at 7:30 p.m.

d. **From the Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF):**

Students were allowed to sign one of the construction beams being used for the new Campus Village Phase 2 and it was a wonderful event (Topping Off Ceremony).

The VPAF hopes to have the link to the University Budget Report available for Senators next Monday, so that they may review the report prior to the Senate meeting on November 2, 2015.

Campus Safety is continued concern. Several instances have been reported where homeless people and others have been found inside of offices in the evenings when staff have unexpectedly returned. This is alarming. The committee raised concern about what could and could not be done given this is a public university.

Questions:

Q: Are there plans for all buildings to be made ADA (Americans Disabilities Act) compliant?
A: Our buildings are very old. Each was built under differing building code requirements. Conducting an analysis across campus of which buildings are and are not compliant would be very extensive.
Q: Is there a Master Plan of where to spend ADA compliance funding?
A: The University nor the CSU has specifically identified funding to support ADA compliance renovations.

e. **From the Vice President for University Advancement (VPUA):**

The Superbowl 50 Champion Tour will include a display of the superbowl trophies that bay area teams have received in the past. The display will be on the east side of the field from 3:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. before the homecoming game.

The VPUA recently attended the VP of Advancements' Council at the CSU. They focused on how to be better advocates for elected officials that support the CSU.

On March 19, 2016 a University Gala Event is planned.

The VPUA is attending the Tower Foundation Board Retreat today and will report back to the Executive Committee at the next meeting.

University Advancement still has several staff positions they need to fill including the Senior Development Director for the College of Business and a Marketing Director position.

Questions:
Q: Does the NFL pay rent to use the South Campus and Locker Rooms?
A: No they do not, but they do pay for any direct costs such as ice, etc.

f. **From the University Library Board (ULB):** No report.

g. **From the Associated Students President (AS):**

AS is considering a resolution asking for open transparency in Professor evaluations that would allow students to see feedback forms on instructors.

Research on high impact practices across all 23 campuses revealed that students were more favorable to taking classes that were called prepatory vs. remedial. SJSU is already using many of the practices identified in the research.

AS has been very busy with Homecoming activities.

4. The committee reviewed and made recommendations to the Provost on nominees to serve on the AVP of Student Academic Success Services (AVP Scharberg) Review Committee. The committee discussed and decided to aim for seven members.

5. The committee discussed Dean Kifer's retirement and the process for the selection of a new Library Dean. The committee discussed and decided on nine members. The membership will include three library faculty, two faculty-at-large selected by the Provost, one student, one staff member elected by the staff of the library, the city librarian, and one administrator. The Deputy Provost will coordinate the call for nominations for the members in the normal manner used for dean search committees. The Executive Committee discussed the need for S06-3 to be reviewed and updated.

6. The committee discussed who serves on the Accessible Technology Instructional Materials Committee. It was decided the Senate Chair should serve.

7.   Chair Kimbarow reported that at the recent Senate Chairs' meeting in Long Beach, there was a push for CSU system-wide open presidential searches. The Faculty Trustee opined that the Chancellor and Board of Trustees would more likely be receptive to increasing the representation of faculty and students on Presidential Search Advisory Committees.

8.   The meeting adjourned at 1:27 p.m. [Note: The meeting adjourned early to allow members to attend Homecoming week activities such as the unveiling of the Peace Pole.]

These minutes were taken and transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on October 12, 2015. They were edited by Chair Kimbarow on October 14, 2015. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on October 26, 2015.   .

Consent Calendar 2015-2016				
November 2, 2015				
Academic Senate Seats	**NAME**	**UNIT**	**TERM**	
Senate Seat	Walt Jacobs	Deans	2016	
Policy Committees				
COMMITTEE	**NAME**	**UNIT**	**TERM**	**NOTES**
Operating Committees				
COMMITTEE	**NAME**	**UNIT**	**TERM**	
Student Fairness	Maggie Morales	Staff Member (Non-Management)	2017	
Student Fairness	Lana Najib	Student	2016	
Other Committees				
COMMITTEE	**NAME**	**UNIT**	**TERM**	
Campus Planning Board	Robb Drury	VP Student Affairs or Designee	EXO	
Remove:				
COMMITTEE	**NAME**	**UNIT**	**TERM**	
Senate Seat	David Steele	Deans	2016	
Campus Planning Board	Cathy Busalacchi	VP Student Affairs or Designee	EXO	

1 San Jose State University
2 Academic Senate
3 Organization and Government Committee   **AS 1579**
4 November 2, 2015
5 Final Reading
6
7   **Policy Recommendation**
8   **Budget Advisory Committee**
9
10 Legislative History: Rescinds SM-S03-1 (which placed the Budget Advisory Committee
11 in rotation with policy committees on the Senate agenda); Modifies S09-6 (to remove
12 content related to a budget advisory committee from our current strategic planning
13 policy); Amends Senate Bylaw 10.1 which provides a listing of special agencies.
14
15 A coded memo from the Chancellor in 1987, provides the directive behind the guidance
16 and establishment of Campus Budget Advisory Committees. Historically, S05-10
17 abolished the existing Budget Advisory Committee and replaced it with a Resource
18 Planning Board. S07-3 then established a Resource Review Board noting that "In
19 practice it was found that the role for the Resource Planning Board envisioned by S05-
20 10 has proved to be unworkable due to budget timelines and the composition of the
21 board. This proposal, if adopted, abolishes the Resource Planning Board and creates a
22 new special agency, the Resource Review Board ". Subsequently S09-6 (Strategic
23 Planning Policy) rescinded S07-3 and established a Strategic Planning Board which
24 would serve as the budget advisory committee. SM-S11-1 then temporarily assigned
25 responsibilities of the Budget Advisory Committee to the Senate Executive Committee
26 (plus 3 additional members) noting that "the SPB has had limited meetings, due to
27 management transitions and considerable uncertainty in the CSU budget. Those same
28 budget uncertainties, however, make it all the more important that the Senate and the
29 campus remain connected to the budget advisory role." Finally, F14-1 revoked the
30 temporary assignment of Budget Advisory Committee responsibilities and returned
31 responsibilities to the Strategic Planning Board.
32
33 Whereas: S09-6, which defined the Strategic Planning Board as the body to serve in
34   the role of a Budget Advisory Committee, is under reconsideration this fall,
35   and
36 Whereas: The SJSU statement on shared governance notes that effective shared
37   governance depends on judicious use of fully collaborative and
38   consultative decision making, and
39 Whereas: The campus has not had an active budget advisory committee as called
40   for in the 1987 coded memo from the Chancellor (BA 87-14) in recent
41   years, therefore be it
42 Resolved: That until such time as S09-6 is updated, provisions in that policy related
43   to a budget advisory committee be removed, and be it further
44 Resolved: That Senate bylaw 10.1 be amended to add the Budget Advisory
45   Committee to the list of special agencies, and be it further

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

49
50
51 Rationale: A budget advisory committee is critically important in the areas of education,
52 engagement, and transparency when it comes to (a) understanding our decentralized
53 budgeting process, (b) identifying problem areas connected to budget allocations and
54 expenditures, (c) serving in an advisory capacity to campus leadership highlighting
55 issues and concerns from the Academic Senate and campus community on budget-
56 related matters, and (d) serving as a resource to the campus community on budget-
57 related questions. This proposal is meant to provide for a budget advisory committee
58 whose charge and responsibilities are in alignment with the principles articulated in the
59 SJSU Statement on Shared Governance and provided by the System Budget Advisory
60 Committee working with the Statewide Academic Senate and California State Student
61 Association and endorsed by the CSU Chancellor in BA 87-14.

62

63	Approved:	9/28/15
64	Vote:	8-0-0
65	Present:	Grosvenor, Mathur, Curry, Gleixner, Shifflett, Elmiaari, Beyersdorf,
66		Becker
67	Absent:	Laker
68	Financial Impact:	None expected.
69	Workload Impact:	Additional workload for members of the Budget Advisory
70		Committee.

71
72
73   **1. Budget Advisory Committee**
74
75 A Budget Advisory Committee is an integral part of the effort to engage the campus
76 community in developing an understanding of our decentralized budgeting process.
77 Working closely with the Vice President for Administration and Finance the Budget
78 Advisory Committee will on a regular basis review reports related to budget/finance
79 situations, identify areas of concern, and provide feedback and input on priorities and
80 solutions. Meeting regularly, the Budget Advisory Committee will be in a good position
81 to address and communicate budget issues to the Academic Senate and faculty as they
82 emerge throughout an academic year.

83
84 The Budget Advisory Committee will be a special agency. In conducting their budget-
85 related work, the President and the Budget Advisory Committee should remain
86 cognizant of the principles in BA 87-14 (Chancellor's coded memo) regarding access to
87 information and consultation. In collaboration with campus leadership the Budget
88 Advisory Committee should strive to serve the campus through education,
89 communication, and transparency.
90
91

1.1 Charge

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

1.2 Membership

Senate Vice Chair (Co-chair)
VP Administration & Finance/CFO (Co-chair)
AVP Academic Budgets & Planning (EXO)
1 Dean
1 Department Chair
2 Faculty Senators
2 Faculty-at-large
AS President or Designee
Academic Affairs Staff Member (finance/budget responsibilities)

1.2.1 Recruitment and Appointment of Members

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

1.2.2 Interim Appointments.

137 When a seat will be vacant for no more than 1 semester (e.g., sabbatical) an interim
138 appointment can be made following normal Committee on Committee processes. Any
139 seat that will be vacant for a year or more will require a replacement for the remainder
140 of the term associated with that seat.
141
142 1.2.3 Replacing Members
143
144 If a member is absent from three regularly scheduled committee meetings in an
145 academic year, the chairs of the Budget Advisory Committee may request that the
146 Associate Vice Chair of the Senate initiate action to recruit a replacement. If a member
147 repeatedly does not perform assigned committee duties, the chairs of the Budget
148 Advisory Committee may request that the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate initiate
149 action to recruit a replacement.
150
151
152
153 **1.3 Responsibilities**
154
155 The co-chairs of the Budget Advisory Committee will convene and preside at meetings,
156 prepare agendas, propose and maintain time-lines for its activities, and take
157 responsibility for the effective operation of the committee. The BAC shall:
158
159 1.3.1 Participate in and facilitate a highly transparent, informative, and participatory
160 campus budget planning and allocation process.
161
162 1.3.2 Participate in a budgeting process that integrates campus strategic goal setting,
163 budget review and planning, and allocations set by the president.
164
165 1.3.3 Participate in the review of the accomplishment of finance goals across divisions
166 and other appropriate units in the context of accountability with respect to the proper
167 use of funds.
168
169 1.3.4 Advise the President regarding the timing and content of annual budget calls.
170
171 1.3.5 Advise the President during the fiscal year regarding significant or unanticipated
172 events that have a significant effect upon campus budget allocations.
173
174 1.3.6 Advise the President regarding the content and format for reporting annual
175 budget data to the campus community in a thorough and consistent manner such that
176 annual changes in the budget are easily tracked and understood.
177
178 1.3.7 Provide annual recommendations to the President regarding the proposed budget
179 allocations across the University's several divisions in line with the University Strategic
180 Plan.
181

182   1.3.8 Receive reports related to enrollment targets and yield and contribute to
183   discussions on proposed budget allocations.
184
185   1.3.9 Review, analyze, and advise the President regarding significant budget actions
186   external to the campus that could impact the University's Operating Fund; e.g., the initial
187   CSU budget proposal and the Governor's May Revise.
188
189   1.3.10 Provide information to the Strategic Planning Committee regarding the
190   alignment of campus resources with the strategic plan.
191
192   At the conclusion of each academic year the Vice Chair of the Senate will complete the
193   summary report required of all special agencies and communicate, at an appropriate
194   level of detail, information related to the Budget Advisory Committee's work directly to
195   the Senate.
196
197   **2. Considerations for the Budget Advisory Committee**
198
199   Information and input from multiple sources and perspectives should be
200   examined whenever possible. Information reported out to the campus
201   community should be in a format that is readily understood and facilitates
202   productive dialogue. The tenor and nature of communication with all individuals
203   and groups providing and receiving budget-related information should be
204   constructive, inclusive, and transparent.
205
206   The Budget Advisory Committee may access as needed all documents related to
207   the campus annual budget as well as expenditures. Committee members would
208   receive the training needed to access available data.
209
210   Given the complexity of our decentralized budgeting processes, the Budget
211   Advisory Committee will need to become knowledgeable with regard to a wide
212   range of SJSU resources, operations and organizations. These are likely to
213   include the following:
214
215   University
216   • Operating Fund Budget & Resources
217   • University Sources and Uses of Funds
218   • Expenditures by Division
219   • Comparisons to other CSU Campuses
220
221   Self Support Operations & Funds
222   • Continuing Education Reserve Fund
223   • Student Health
224   • University Housing
225   • University Parking
226   • Capital Outlay & Deferred Maintenance
227   • Intercollegiate Athletics

228 • Lottery
229 • Student Fees (e.g., Student Success, Excellence, & Technology Fee)
230
231 Auxiliary Organizations
232 • Associated Students
233 • Research Foundation
234 • Spartan Shops, Inc.
235 • Student Union, Inc.
236 • Tower Foundation
237
238
239 **3.0 Policy Modifications**
240
241 Following implementation, if modifications to this policy appear needed the Vice Chair of
242 the Senate will provide the Academic Senate Chair with the Budget Advisory
243 Committee's suggestions. The Chair of the Academic Senate will then refer the
244 recommendation(s) out to the appropriate policy committees for timely review and
245 subsequent action.

1 **SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Instruction & Student Affairs Committee**
4 **November 2, 2015**   **AS 1582**
5 **Final Reading**
6
7   **Policy Recommendation**
8   **Academic Integrity**
9
10 Legislative history: Rescinds S07-2
11
12 Background: S07-2 laid out the University's Policy on Academic Integrity. Since that
13   time, it has been determined that
14
15   •   academic sanctions for infractions of academic integrity have been
16   imposed in inconsistent ways across campus;
17   •   student misconduct often goes unreported, resulting in a lack of
18   university knowledge, input, and oversight and an inability of the
19   university to recognize patterns of conduct;
20   •   no formal grade appeal process currently exists for accused
21   students who are found not responsible in the student conduct
22   process or whose cases are dismissed.
23
24   Partly for these reasons, the University has not been in complete
25   compliance with CSU executive orders on academic integrity (E.O. 1037,
26   1068, and 1098). This policy addresses the problems.
27
28 Resolved: That the attached be implemented as policy, rescinding S07-2.
29
30 Rationale: There is a need for faculty members to report all instances of academic
31   misconduct and provide a complete record of accused students' academic
32   performance; equal treatment demands it. The University can gain
33   awareness of patterns of infraction only if it has a record of student
34   infractions.
35
36   Student rights must also be upheld. Currently, student conduct violations
37   and faculty academic sanctions are reviewed by the Office of Student
38   Conduct and Ethical Development (SCED). When SCED reaches a finding
39   in favor of the student – either the finding of not responsible or a lack of
40   evidence of the violation – the faculty member may appeal the decision to
41   the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility
42   (BAFPR).
43

44		However, a student has no comparable avenue of appeal when the faculty
45		member refuses to lift a sanction after a SCED finding in the student's
46		favor. At present, faculty members who have imposed academic sanctions
47		on students accused of misconduct are not required to remove those
48		sanctions if the student is found not responsible by SCED. The BAFPR
49		has both the expertise and infrastructure to review this kind of dispute
50		regardless of which party brings the issue to BAFPR's attention.
51		
52	Approved:	9/21/15
53	Vote:	15-0-0
54	Present:	Walters, Sofish, Kelley, Kaufman, Sullivan-Green, Medina, Sen,
55		Khan, Wilson, Branz (non-voting), Bruck (non-voting), Medrano,
56		Gay, Abdukheir, Amante, Brooks, Rees
57	Absent:	Campsey
58	Financial Impact:	None
59	Workload Impact:	Increase for members of the Board of Academic Freedom and
60		Professional Responsibility
61		

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
POLICY ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

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

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

STUDENT ROLE

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

1. know the rules that preserve academic integrity and abide by them at all times, including learning and abiding by rules associated with specific classes, exams, and course assignments;

2. know the consequences of violating the Academic Integrity Policy;

3. know the appeal rights and procedures to be followed in the event of an appeal;

4. foster academic integrity among peers.

FACULTY ROLE

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

1. provide a clear and concise course syllabus that apprises students of the Academic Integrity Policy and the ethical standards and supporting procedures required in a course;

2. make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct. Specifically, examinations should be appropriately proctored or monitored by university personnel to prevent students from copying, using non-cited resources, or exchanging information. Examinations and answers to examination questions should be kept private. Efforts should be made to give unique and varied assignments;

103

3. take action against a student in accordance with this policy when supporting
    evidence indicates that the student has violated the Academic Integrity Policy;

4. comply with the rules and standards of the Academic Integrity Policy.

ROLE OF THE OFFICE OF STUDENT CONDUCT
AND ETHICAL DEVELOPMENT

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

1. comply with and enforce the Student Conduct Code[1], which includes the Academic
    Integrity Policy;

2. adjudicate student conduct cases and assign administrative sanctions to students
    who have violated the Student Conduct Code;

3. serve as a resource for faculty, staff, and students on matters of academic integrity
    and this policy;

4. ensure dissemination of the policy to the campus community when changes are
    made to the policy or procedures.

1.0 **DEFINITIONS OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY**

    1.1 **CHEATING**

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

        1.1.1 copying, in part or as a whole, from another's test or other
        evaluation instrument, including homework assignments,
        worksheets, lab reports, essays, summaries, and quizzes;

        1.1.2 submitting work previously graded in another course without prior
        approval by the course instructor or by departmental policy;

---

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

1.1.3   submitting work simultaneously presented in two courses without prior approval of both course instructors or by the departmental policies of both departments;

1.1.4   using or consulting sources, tools, or materials prohibited by the instructor prior to or during an examination;

1.1.5   altering or interfering with the grading process;

1.1.6   sitting for an examination by a surrogate or as a surrogate;

1.1.7   any other act committed by a student in the course of his or her academic work that defrauds or misrepresents, including aiding others in any of the actions defined above.

1.2   **PLAGIARISM**

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

Plagiarism includes

1.2.1   knowingly or unknowingly incorporating the ideas, words, sentences, paragraphs, parts of sentences or paragraphs, or the specific substance of another's work without giving appropriate credit, and representing the product as one's own work;

1.2.2   representing another's artistic or scholarly works, such as computer programs, instrument printouts, inventions, musical compositions, photographs, paintings, drawings, sculptures, novels, short stories, poems, screen plays, or television scripts, as one's own.

2.0   **NOTIFICATION OF STANDARDS OF DETECTING PLAGIARISM**

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

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

186 ownership rights of all submitted work shall remain with the work's author and not with
187 the plagiarism-detection service.
188
189 3.0 **SANCTIONS**
190
191 There shall be two major classifications of sanctions that may be imposed for violations
192 of this policy: academic and administrative. Academic sanctions are actions related to
193 coursework or grades and are determined by the faculty member. Administrative
194 sanctions are actions that address a student's status on campus and are determined by
195 SCED. Academic sanctions and administrative sanctions may be imposed
196 simultaneously.
197
198 3.1 **ACADEMIC SANCTIONS**
199
200 Faculty members are responsible for determining academic sanctions. Faculty
201 members may find it helpful to consult with their department chair or school
202 director, senior faculty members, or the director of SCED in consideration of
203 appropriate academic sanctions. Such sanctions shall be proportional to the
204 offense. The academic sanction is usually a form of "grade modification." Before
205 sanctions can be employed, the faculty member must have verified the
206 instance(s) of academic dishonesty by personal observation or documentation.
207 The faculty member is expected to maintain in confidence notes and
208 communications between the student and the faculty member as they may be
209 relevant in subsequent disciplinary proceedings or any subsequent legal actions.
210
211 Recommended academic sanctions include
212
213 3.1.1 oral reprimand;
214
215 3.1.2 repetition of the assignment with sufficient change in instructions
216 such that none of the original assignment can be utilized;
217
218 3.1.3 lower grade on the evaluation instrument;
219
220 3.1.4 failure on the evaluation instrument;
221
222 3.1.5 reduction in course grade;
223
224 3.1.6 failure in the course;
225
226 3.1.7 recommendation of additional administrative sanctions (SCED to
227 review for possible violations of the Student Conduct Code).
228

229		*Faculty Discretion*
230		
231		Incidents involving the careless or inept handling of quoted material that
232		fall short of the definitions of cheating or plagiarism, as defined in Items
233		1.1 and 1.2 of this policy, may be dealt with at the discretion of the faculty
234		member concerned.
235		
236		The faculty member also has the discretion and obligation to determine
237		whether specific acts by a student fall under the description in 1.1.7.
238		
239	3.2	**ADMINISTRATIVE SANCTIONS**
240		
241		As stipulated in Executive Order 1098 (Student Conduct Procedures), violations
242		of the Student Conduct Code (Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations
243		Section 41301), including cheating or plagiarism in connection with an academic
244		program, may warrant expulsion, suspension, probation, or a lesser sanction.
245		Administrative action involving academic dishonesty shall be the responsibility of
246		SCED. SCED shall respond to referrals from the faculty of violations of the
247		Academic Integrity Policy. It shall further respond to repeat violations as brought
248		to its attention by the centralized reports filed with SCED.
249		
250		SCED shall notify faculty members when action has been taken. It shall maintain
251		a record of students who have been reported for violating the Academic Integrity
252		Policy.
253		
254	4.0	**EVALUATION AND REPORTING**
255		
256		When a faculty member suspects a violation of the Academic Integrity Policy and is in
257		possession of evidence to substantiate that violation (not excluding a statement of
258		personal observation of the infraction by the faculty member or other SJSU personnel or
259		students in the class), it is the faculty member's responsibility to take the following
260		steps:
261		
262	4.1	Confront the situation discretely; that is, faculty members shall not discuss
263		specific charges of cheating, plagiarism, or any other violations involving
264		specific individuals in the classroom or elsewhere before other members
265		of the class.
266		
267	4.2	Communicate with the student concerning the alleged violation and
268		arrange for a conference to present documentation. In this conference, the
269		student should be advised of the allegation and be made aware of the
270		supporting evidence and probable consequences. The student should be
271		provided the opportunity to provide his/her perspective and respond to the

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

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

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

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

5.0   PROTECTION OF STUDENT RIGHTS

---

[2] Currently available at https://publicdocs.maxient.com/reportingform.php?SanJoseStateUniv&layout_id=2. Reporting of infractions is mandated by CSU Executive Order 1098.

5.1   Students are guaranteed due process, including the right to be informed of the charges and nature of the evidence supporting the charges and to have a meeting with the faculty member, SCED, or other decision makers. At any such meeting, statements and evidence on behalf of the student may be submitted. This policy is not intended to deny the right to appeal of any decision through appropriate university channels.

5.2   SCED shall review the academic sanction imposed by a faculty member on a student and determine whether evidence exists in support of the instructor's allegation. It shall also make an assessment of the proportionality of the sanction to the severity of the infraction and may recommend a reduction or increase in sanction severity. This assessment shall be made in consideration of consistency across the campus.

5.3   If upon review by SCED, the student is found not responsible of the charges or if insufficient evidence has been presented by the instructor to establish responsibility, then the student shall be exonerated and the case dismissed. In this event, the record of the alleged violation shall be expunged and academic sanctions against the student prohibited, barring an appeal by the faculty member to the Board of Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR). If SCED finds that sanctions should be modified, the instructor must make those modifications, again barring an appeal by the faculty member to the BAFPR. Should the instructor refuse to lift or modify the sanctions recommended by SCED, the case shall be referred to the BAFPR. This section represents an exception to University Policy S99-9, Section IV.2.

5.4   If the BAFPR upholds the findings of SCED to exonerate the student or to modify the sanction, the instructor must lift the sanction imposed or modify it accordingly. If the instructor refuses to do so, as per CSU Executive Order 1037, "it is the responsibility of other qualified faculty to do so … [i.e.] one or more persons with academic training comparable to the instructor of record who are presently on the faculty at that campus." Preferably, the department chair or school director, in conjunction with associate dean of the relevant college, shall be compelled to do so. If the remedial action has not been taken within a reasonable time as determined by the BAFPR, a request to the President, Provost or appropriate vice president shall be made to expedite the resolution.

5.5   All reasonable accommodations shall then be provided to the exonerated student if there is a fear of retaliation by the instructor. Accommodations might include the ability to retake the course without charge from a different instructor or to substitute a different course (the latter if approved

353		by the student's advisor). If retaking the same course, credit for
354		assignments completed in the previous attempt shall be afforded if
355		comparable. Academic standing shall be returned to its status before the
356		imposition of a reversed sanction.
357		
358	5.4	**Student Appeal Process**. An appeal must be filed in writing to the
359		BAFPR before the last day of instruction of the semester following that in
360		which the academic sanction was imposed. The sanctions imposed and
361		the SCED findings shall be taken up by the BAFPR within 30 days of the
362		official filing of the appeal. Evidence submitted by both student and faculty
363		member shall be considered and the determination of responsibility shall
364		be assessed.
365		
366	6.0	**THREATS**
367		
368	Threats against any member of the faculty as a consequence of implementing this	
369	policy on academic integrity shall be cause for disciplinary action under the Student	
370	Conduct Code (Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations Section 41301), and may	
371	also result in civil and criminal action.	
372		
373	7.0	**DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION**
374		
375	7.1	The Academic Integrity Policy shall be published in the university catalog
376		and on the university website. Copies of this policy shall also be held in
377		every department office and SCED.
378		
379	7. 2	Dissemination of this information shall be the responsibility of SCED.
380		Information is available at http://www.sjsu.edu/studentconduct/.
381		
382	7.3	SCED shall submit a statistical report on the number and types of
383		violations and their eventual disposition to the Academic Senate annually.
384		
385	7.4	College and departments/schools are encouraged to discuss periodically
386		this policy at faculty meetings, including discussion of strategies for
387		ensuring academic integrity among students and consistency among
388		faculty.
389		
390	7.5	Department chairs, school directors, and program directors should ensure
391		that new faculty members receive a copy of this policy and an oral
392		explanation at the time they are given their first class assignment.
393		
394		

1 San José State University
2 Academic Senate
3 Organization and Government Committee   **AS 1585**
4 November 2, 2015
5 Final Reading
6
7   **Policy Recommendation**
8   **Updating the Board of General Studies Membership, Charge, and**
9   **Responsibilities**
10
11 Legislative History: Rescinds S02-7 and S96-9 which covered the structure and
12 procedures for the Board of General studies. The language in S02-7 said "Resolved:
13 that University Policy S96-9 be amended and replaced as follows", however, the record
14 shows S02-7 as having modified rather than rescinding S96-9.
15
16
17 Whereas: Assessing each of five core competencies at the university level is
18   required by WASC, and
19
20 Whereas: SJSU needs to develop methods and procedures for assessing each of
21   the core competencies, and
22
23 Whereas: The Board of General Studies (BOGS) has the breadth and depth of
24   understanding of the curricula and courses where the core competencies
25   are developed, and
26
27 Whereas: A request has been made to review the membership of the BOGS along
28   with who should chair this committee, and
29
30 Whereas: Addition of the Director of Assessment to BOGS could facilitate the work
31   of this committee, and
32
33 Whereas: Recently substantial changes have been made to our General Education
34   program (see 2014 Guidelines for General Education [GE], American
35   Institutions [AI], and the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement
36   [GWAR]) in part to (a) respond to Executive Order 1100 (EO-1100)
37   governing GE, and to (b) define categories for double counting in the
38   major to help high-unit degree programs comply with the CSU's 120 unit
39   degree program requirement, and
40
41 Whereas: Sections of S02-7 are outdated, therefore be it
42
43 Resolved: That S96-9 and S02-7 be rescinded and replaced with the information
44   provided in this policy recommendation.
45

1

46   Rationale: In the process of working on two separate referrals that impact S02-7, it was
47   noted that additional items in S02-7 need updating and that S96-9 had been
48   superseded by S02-7. O&G discussed (on 8/24) combining referrals related to S02-7
49   into one policy recommendation replacing S02-7. The first referral pertained to the
50   assessment of core competencies. The second item was related to BOGS membership.
51   A third referral focused on the need to update S02-7 with respect to duplication of
52   content in the 2014 Guidelines, references to CSU executive order 1100, assessment,
53   and deletion of sections no longer relevant. Hence, this policy recommendation
54   provides an update of University Policy with respect to the membership, charge, and
55   responsibilities of BOGS and keeps the content of this policy distinct from information in
56   the 2014 Guidelines for GE, AI, and GWAR.
57
58   Core Competencies: BOGS has the experience necessary to facilitate wide-ranging
59   dialogues with faculty regarding methods, procedures, and the infrastructure needed to
60   develop and implement strategies to evaluate core competencies. If there are policy or
61   senate management implications that emerge, BOGS can bring recommendations to
62   the senate via the Curriculum & Research Committee for referral to a policy committee
63   as needed.
64
65   BOGS Membership: The changes proposed brings policy language up to date to reflect
66   our structure of seven rather than eight colleges and provides support, through addition
67   of the Director of Assessment, for the ongoing work of the Board with respect to the
68   assessment of curricula and courses. In addition, it provides for the appointment of a
69   faculty member to chair the Board.
70
71   Additional updates to S02-7. Updates are needed to remove content that duplicates
72   information in the 2014 Guidelines for GE, AI, and GWAR (hereafter referred to as
73   Guidelines). This also results in keeping all content regarding the structure, definitions,
74   and procedures related to GE in one location - namely the Guidelines and consolidating
75   information regarding the charge, membership, and responsibilities of BOGs in this
76   policy recommendation. Section V from S02-7 is obsolete and needs to be deleted as it
77   pertains to a call for a complete review of the GE program be conducted in 2005.
78
79   Summary of changes:
80
81   • Updates titles.
82   • Membership updates. BOGS shall consist of ten members: seven teaching faculty
83   (representing seven colleges), one student, the AVP for Graduate & Undergraduate
84   Programs or designee (EXO; non voting), and the Director of Assessment (EXO;
85   non voting).
86   • Establishing a faculty chair. The Chair shall be a faculty member with at least one
87   year of service on the Board.
88   • Modification with respect to voting. Ex officio members will be non-voting members
89   with the exception that in the case of ties, the AVP for Graduate & Undergraduate
90   Programs or designee may vote.
91   • Updates information related to CSU Executive Order.

92   • Updates policy to accurately reflect current practices in BOGS in alignment with the
93   Guidelines.
94   • Adds information related to assessment of core competencies to the Board's
95   responsibilities.
96   • Adds to procedures section, including discipline-specific faculty, as needed, in
97   discussions concerning proposals when the board determines additional expertise is
98   needed.
99
100 Approved: 10/19/15
101 Vote: 7-0-0
102 Present: Mathur, Shifflett, El-Miaari, Beyersdorf, Gleixner, Becker, Laker
103 Absent: Grosvenor, Curry
104
105 Financial Impact: None expected
106 Workload Impact: No change from current situation

Board of General Studies Membership, Charge, and Responsibilities

1. Board of General Studies

Executive order 1100 (which superseded EO 1065) provides guidance on a range of issues including implementation and governance pertaining to CSU General Education Breadth Requirements. Specifically, section 6.2.3 notes that "each campus shall have a broadly representative standing committee, a majority of which shall be instructional faculty, and which shall also include student membership, to provide for appropriate oversight and to make appropriate recommendations concerning the implementation, conduct and evaluation of these requirements."

1.1 *Charge*

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

1.2 *Membership*

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

1.2.1 *Election and Appointment of Members*

1.2.1.1 The faculty members of the Board shall be elected by the faculty electorate in each college in an election administered by the Dean's office. Each department in a college shall be informed of a pending election and shall nominate one tenured faculty member.
1.2.1.2 Prior to the departmental nomination, each person seeking nomination shall prepare and circulate to the department faculty a brief (not more than 100 words) statement summarizing her/his experience and objectives in General Education.
1.2.1.3 The college curriculum committee shall select not more than three of those nominated to place before the college electorate. The college curriculum

147   committee may choose to meet and consult with the Provost (or designee) prior
148   to making the selection.
149   1.2.1.4 Selection by each college curriculum committee shall be based on
150   interest, competence, and experience in the General Education curricula; the
151   statements prepared by departmental nominees shall be considered.
152   1.2.1.5. Faculty shall serve three-year staggered terms. When a full-term
153   vacancy is to be filled, or a vacancy for an unexpired term of more than one
154   year, applications shall be solicited from the college, and an election held as
155   provided above.
156   1.2.1.6. Vacancies of one year or less shall be filled for the balance of the
157   unexpired term. The college curriculum committee in consultation with the Dean
158   shall select a member to fill the vacancy. Consideration shall be given to, among
159   others, those who applied for the last vacancy for which college-wide solicitation
160   was required.
161   1.2.1.7. A faculty member of the Board may be granted a leave for one
162   semester. A one semester interim appointment may then be made as provided
163   in 1.2.1.6.
164   1.2.1.8. If a college is unable to elect a faculty member to the Board, then the
165   position will be filled for one year by the college curriculum committee in
166   consultation with the Dean.
167   1.2.1.9. Student appointments should be made on the basis of interest,
168   experience in the General Education curricula, and a scholastic record of
169   academic excellence. Student members of the Board shall be appointed by the
170   Provost in consultation with the elected members of the Executive Committee
171   and the Associated Students President.
172   1.2.1.10. Student appointees shall serve one-year terms and may seek
173   independent study credit by working with the Chair of BOGS.
174
175 **1.2.2** The Chair shall be a faculty member with at least one year of service on the
176 Board. College faculty representatives through a vote will select the chair from among
177 those with continuing appointments before the end of the spring semester for the
178 subsequent year.
179
180 **1.2.3** Ex officio members will be non-voting members with the exception that in the
181 case of ties, the AVP or his/her designee to the committee may vote.
182
183 **1.2.4** If a member is absent from three regularly scheduled committee meetings in an
184 academic year the chair of BOGS may request that the Associate Vice Chair of the
185 Senate initiate action leading to the election of a new member. If a member repeatedly
186 does not perform assigned committee duties, the chair of BOGS may request that the
187 Associate Vice Chair of the Senate initiate action leading to the election of a new
188 member.
189
190 **1.3 *Responsibilities of the Board of General Studies***

191 **1.3.1** The Board shall report to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

192 **1.3.2** Members are expected to know the current Guidelines for GE, AI, and GWAR.

193 **1.3.3** The Board shall actively solicit courses and curricular proposals designed to
194 satisfy General Education requirements from all colleges and departments of the
195 University, shall review, and where appropriate approve courses and curricular
196 proposals for purposes of General Education, and shall evaluate existing GE, AI, and
197 GWAR courses and curricula.

198 **1.3.4** The Board, in consultation with the appropriate college deans and department
199 chairpersons, shall provide for and approve modifications to requirements requested by
200 degree programs in accordance with the 2014 Guidelines.

201 **1.3.5** The Board shall consider petitions from programs for relief from the fifty-one
202 semester hour General Education requirement. Petitions shall be approved whenever
203 the total number of units required for purposes of formal accreditation of the program,
204 plus the units required for General Education, exceed the maximum number of units
205 that can be required for the degree under Trustee regulations.

206 **1.3.6** Policy proposals affecting General Education curricula shall be brought to the
207 Academic Senate by the Curriculum and Research Committee. The Organization and
208 Government Committee shall present policy proposals relating to charge, membership,
209 and responsibilities of BOGS.

210 **1.3.7** Annually, early in Fall Semester, the Board will provide for the Senate (through
211 Curriculum and Research Committee) a written report on its activities for the preceding
212 academic year.

213 **1.3.8** The Board shall, in consultation with the Director of Assessment and the Director
214 for Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics, develop and implement strategies for the
215 periodic evaluation of these core competencies: Information Literacy, Written
216 Communication, Oral Communication, Critical Thinking, and Quantitative Reasoning. If
217 there are policy or senate management implications that emerge, BOGS will bring
218 recommendations to the senate via the Curriculum & Research Committee for referral to
219 a policy committee as needed.

220 1.3.9 In accordance with the 2014 Guidelines, BOGS is responsible for the assessment
221 and continuing certification of GE, AI, and GWAR courses.

222 **1.4 *Procedures***

223 The following shall apply to the proceedings of BOGS:

224 **1.4.1** Meetings of the Board shall be open to the campus community, except in cases
225 where BOGS elects to conduct votes in closed session.

226 **1.4.2** Departmental representatives (normally course coordinators and chairs/directors)
227 shall be invited in a timely manner by BOGS to attend, as needed, Board meetings at

228 which their course(s) will be discussed. No vote to reject a proposal shall be taken until
229 departmental representatives have been invited to a discussion of their proposal.

230 **1.4.3** At the Board's discretion, discipline-specific faculty will be invited to participate in
231 discussions concerning proposals when the board determines additional expertise is
232 needed.

233 **1.4.4** If the Board denies certification of a new course, it shall provide the course
234 coordinator with written feedback, explaining the reasons for denial. If the Board
235 recommends to the Curriculum and Research (C&R) Committee that a course be
236 decertified, it shall provide C& R and the course coordinator with written feedback
237 explaining the reasons for the recommended decertification. For both new and
238 continuing certification, the Board may not raise in subsequent proceedings on the
239 same course additional objections, except those that apply to new materials submitted.

240 **1.4.5** If the Board proposes guidelines regarding criteria for certification or continuing
241 certification in addition to those prescribed by University policy, these guidelines shall
242 be submitted to the Curriculum and Research Committee for policy review and will
243 subsequently be made available to all course coordinators.

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

246 **2. Subsequent Review**

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

1 San José State University
2 Academic Senate
3 Organization and Government Committee   **AS 1586**
4 November 2, 2015
5 Final Reading
6
7   **Policy Recommendation**
8   **Modification of Human Subjects Institutional Review Board Membership**
9
10 Legislative History: Amends S08-7 - Policy for Protection of Human Research Subjects.
11 SM-F05-1 created an IRB-HS task force whose work culminated in S08-7. SM-F05-2
12 added members (CASA, Social Sciences, Education) to the Institutional Review Board -
13 Human Subjects. SM-S05-3 added to the IRB-HS charge that the Board may also
14 provide information to the campus on IRB_HS procedures, compliance, rules and
15 regulations. SM-S00-1 provided for one faculty member from each Senate
16 representative unit.
17
18 Whereas: The Institutional Review Board – Human Subjects (IRB-HS) requested a
19   referral to the Organization and Governance Committee regarding
20   membership and voting, and
21
22 Whereas: Structural changes in Academic Affairs have an impact on titles and
23   representation on existing committees; and
24
25 Whereas: There is a clear need for members to have substantial experience and
26   knowledge in the administration of federal, state, and SJSU regulations
27   and policies that pertain to research with human subjects; therefore be it
28
29 Resolved: That University Policy S08-7 be amended to reflect the revisions detailed
30   below.
31
32
33 Rationale: Effective review of IRB protocols requires that the committee members have
34 significant training in, and knowledge of, federal, state, and SJSU regulations and
35 policies that pertain to research with human subjects. For that reason, the committee
36 functions more effectively (i.e., reviews protocols more consistently and more
37 accurately) when the board includes a substantial number of members who have been
38 on the committee for a longer period of time. The change to designation of the
39 physician member to a consultant (as needed) reflects the fact, grounded in experience,
40 that this person is not needed for the review of all protocols. Finally, for compliance
41 reasons the IRB coordinator needs to be a voting member of the IRB-HS.   Federal
42 regulations for the Protection of Human Subjects allow for an expedited review
43 procedure for minor changes to previously approved research and for continuing review
44 of research if the original review was also conducted through an expedited review and
45 the research continues to be minimal risk. According to the regulations an expedited
46 review "may be carried out by the IRB chairperson or by one or more experienced

47 reviewers designated by the chairperson from among the members of the IRB." In our
48 case, that person is the IRB coordinator. The implication is that the member carrying
49 out the review has voting status because they "can exercise all of the authorities of the
50 IRB except that the reviewer may not disapprove the research." (45 CFR 46.110(b))
51
52
53 **Proposed Changes** (to section VI.A.4 of S08-7):
54
55 Delete Associate Dean of Graduate Studies
56 Add Associate Dean of Research
57 Make the IRB Coordinator Seat ex officio - voting
58 Modify physician seat to reflect the need for a Kinesiological Consultant with a term of
59 'as needed'
60 Add a section VI.A.4.e that reads:
61 Recruitment and Appointment of Members.
62
63 (1) Each faculty member serves a 3-year term renewable for one additional 3-
64 year term. Student and community members serve 1-year terms. Recruitment of
65 faculty and student members to serve on the IRB-HS will be done through the
66 normal Committee on Committees process for the seats designated for faculty
67 and student members.
68
69 (2) All applicants will submit a one page written statement describing their
70 qualifications to serve on the board. It is strongly recommended that applicants
71 attach their certificate verifying completion of one of the online CITI
72 (Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative) human subjects research courses
73 (see http://www.sjsu.edu/research/irb/irb-researcher-training/index.html). Upon
74 appointment members must complete one of the online CITI courses prior to
75 attending the first scheduled meeting.
76
77 (3) Recommendations for a physician to serve as Kinesiological Consultant will
78 be solicited from the SJSU Kinesiology Department Chair.
79
80 (4) When there are multiple applications for any seat the Executive Committee of
81 the Academic Senate will select individuals to serve. In considering potential
82 IRB-HS members attention should focus on the person's research skills and
83 experience and careful consideration of the balance of new and continuing
84 members so the board retains experienced members yet also brings on new
85 members.
86
87 Approved: 9/28/15
88 Vote: 8-0-0
89 Present: Grosvenor, Beyersdorf, Mathur, Curry, Gleixner, Shifflett, Becker,
90   El-Miaari
91 Absent: Laker
92 Financial Impact: None expected

93	Workload Impact: No change from current situation
94	
95	
96	**Complete membership list**:
97	
98	IRB Coordinator (EXO)
99	Associate Dean of Research (EXO)
100	2 Faculty, Applied Sciences & Arts
101	1 Faculty, Business
102	2 Faculty, Education
103	1 Faculty, Engineering
104	1 Faculty, General Unit
105	1 Faculty, Humanities & the Arts
106	1 Faculty, Science
107	2 Faculty, Social Sciences
108	1 Student
109	1 Community-at-large (1 year appointment)
110	1 Physician or Licensed Health Professional
111	1 Physician (Kinesiological Consultant) (term: as needed)
112	1 Prisoner Advocate (term: as needed)
113	

1 San José State University
2 Academic Senate
3 Organization and Government Committee   **AS 1587**
4 November 2, 2015
5 Final Reading
6
7   **Senate Management Resolution**
8   **Dissolving the Heritage, Preservation & Public History Committee**
9
10 Legislative History and Background: S05-5 created the Heritage, Preservation & Public
11 History Committee with a charge to "advise the Senate and the President and propose
12 resolutions and policies as appropriate" with regard to preserving buildings, sites,
13 papers and other items related to SJSU's history. SM-S09-1 changed the membership
14 to remove the SJSU History Webmaster. The referral to the O&G committee in March
15 of 2013 noted that the chair of the Committee on Committees and the chair of the
16 Heritage, Preservation & Public History Committee were having difficulty finding
17 individuals to serve in the 11 open seats at the time.
18
19 Whereas: The Heritage, Preservation & Public History Committee has not been
20   engaged in much activity in recent years; and
21
22 Whereas: The Heritage, Preservation & Public History Committee voted this fall to
23   dissolve the committee; therefore be it
24
25 Resolved: That the Heritage, Preservation & Public History Committee be dissolved
26   effective with the approval of this resolution, and be it further
27
28 Resolved: That S08-4 (Campus Planning Board) be modified to add a third item (2.c)
29   to the Campus Planning Board's responsibilities as follows: As needed
30   provide advice to the President on matters related to historical buildings
31   and grounds.
32
33 Rationale: Minutes from the fall 2013 O&G meeting with the chair of the Heritage,
34 Preservation & Public History Committee noted as challenges for the committee: lack of
35 participation, type of participation, lack of financial support, no champion, no significant
36 action items or substance. The question was raised at that time about dissolving the
37 committee. The referral (which originated with the committee chair) to the O&G
38 committee also noted that the public history component of the committee's charge had
39 not been addressed over the eight years since the committee was formed. This fall,
40 members of the Heritage, Preservation & Public History Committee met and voted to
41 dissolve the committee. In addition, components of the committee's charge are
42 embedded in other committee's work: The new library policy has language specific to
43 the preservation of materials unique to SJSU, rare and valuable materials, and
44 materials relevant for historical research; the campus planning board has
45 responsibilities that include advising the president regarding the planning, location,
46 construction and operation of structures, facilities, plantings, and landscape design.

47 Therefore, at this point in time the Heritage, Preservation & Public History Committee
48 should be dissolved.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83 Approved: 9/28/15
84 Vote: 8-0-0
85 Present: Grosvenor, Mathur, Curry, Shifflett, Elmiaari, Gleixner, Becker,
86   Beyersdorf
87 Absent: Laker
88 Financial Impact: None
89 Workload Impact: None
90

1 SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
2 Academic Senate
3 Instruction & Student Affairs Committee
4 November 2, 2015   **AS 1589**
5 First Reading
6
7   **Policy recommendation:**
8   **Attendance and Participation**

9   Background: University Policy F69-24 ('Attendance') established that "attendance, per
10 se, could not be used as a criterion for grading." University policy F06-2 ('Greensheets')
11 reiterated this and stated that "if you grade on participation (which can be used) some
12 indication of how participation will be assessed should be included,…" Despite this
13 clarification, there is still confusion about the distinction between attendance and
14 participation, and a significant number of cases still come to Student Fairness in which
15 faculty have not disclosed the manner in which participation shall be included in a course
16 grade. This replacement for F69-24 further clarifies what is necessary if a faculty
17 member wants to use participation as part of a course grade.

18 **Whereas:**   Confusion exists among faculty and students about University policy
19   about grading on attendance and participation

20 **Resolved:**   that F69-24 (Attendance) be rescinded.
21
22 **Resolved:**   Attendance shall not be used as a criterion for grading.
23
24 **Resolved:**   Students are expected to attend all meetings for the courses in which
25   they are enrolled as they are responsible for material discussed therein,
26   and active participation is frequently essential to ensure maximum benefit
27   to all class members. In some cases, attendance is fundamental to
28   course objectives; for example, students may be required to interact with
29   others in the class. Attendance is the responsibility of the student.
30
31 **Resolved:**   Participation may be used as a criterion for grading when the parameters
32   and their evaluation are clearly defined in the course syllabus and the
33   percentage of the overall grade is stated.
34
35
36 Approved: October 26, 2015
37 Vote: 14-0-0
38 Present: Walters, Sofish, Kaufman, Sullivan-Green, Medina, Sen, Khan,
39   Wilson, Medrano, Gay, Abukhdeir, Amante, Campsey, Simpson,
40   Branz (non-voting), Bruck (non-voting)
41 Absent: Kelley, Brooks, Rees
42
43 Curricular Impact: More clarity for students
44
45 Financial Impact: None
46
47 Workload impact: Fewer cases brought to the Student Fairness Committee

1 San Jose State University
2 Academic Senate
3 Organization and Government Committee   **AS 1590**
4 November 2, 2015
5 First Reading
6
7   **Senate Management Resolution**
8   **Remote Attendance at Senate and Committee Meetings**
9
10 Legislative History: New By-law proposals and modification of existing By-law 4.2.
11
12 Whereas: Requests have been received from members of the Executive Committee
13   and members of policy and operating committees to participate in
14   meetings via teleconferencing, and
15
16 Whereas: Senate by-laws clearly establish expectations and standards for
17   attendance at Senate and committee meetings but is silent on whether
18   participating via teleconferencing or web-based conferencing fulfills the
19   attendance requirements, and
20
21 Whereas: Guidance is needed on the issue for members and committee chairs, and
22
23 Whereas: Viewpoints and needs associated with in-person requirements vary, but
24   equity, access, and participation are shared values, therefore be it
25
26 Resolved   That additions be made to Senate by-laws to provide guidelines regarding
27   remote attendance at Senate and committee meetings as follows:
28
29 Modify by-law 4.2 to read: Any action taken by the Executive Committee requires the
30 presence of a quorum of the elected members. At the discretion of the Senate Chair
31 remote attendance may be permitted when appropriate and reliable resources are
32 available and the work of the committee will not be compromised.
33
34 Add by-law 6.14: Members of policy committees are expected to attend meetings in
35 person. At the discretion of the policy committee chair remote attendance may be
36 permitted when appropriate and reliable resources are available and the work of the
37 committee will not be compromised.
38
39 Add by-law 7.2; d: Members of special committees are expected to attend meetings in
40 person. At the discretion of the committee chair remote attendance may be permitted
41 when appropriate and reliable resources are available and the work of the committee
42 will not be compromised.
43
44 Add by-law 9.5: Any action taken by the Senate requires the presence of a quorum of
45 the elected members. At the discretion of the Senate chair remote attendance may be

46 permitted when appropriate and reliable resources are available and the work of the
47 Senate will not be compromised.
48
49 Add by-law 10.3; g: Members of special agencies are expected to attend meetings in
50 person. At the discretion of the chair remote attendance may be permitted when
51 appropriate and reliable resources are available and the work of the committee will not
52 be compromised.
53
54
55 Rationale: The option to attend meetings from a remote location is potentially beneficial
56 in terms of morale and equity (e.g., balance domestic and work obligations, commuting
57 distance). Given the expansion of technological tools that facilitate remote
58 communication some amount of flexibility should be available regarding meeting
59 attendance. However, at the same time, campus resources may not be robust or
60 reliable enough, depending on the location, to make remote attendance feasible. In
61 addition, the availability of technical support, or lack thereof, for committee chairs will
62 likely influence the viability of remote attendance. Of utmost importance is the quality of
63 the exchange of ideas and information among members thus in-person attendance
64 should be the norm while allowing for exceptions in cases where it is clear that the work
65 of the group will not be compromised.
66
67
68 Approved: 10/26/15
69 Vote: 6-1-0
70 Present: Laker, Shifflett, Beyersdorf, Becker, Gleixner. Curry, Grosvenor
71 Absent: El-Miaari, Mathur
72 Financial Impact: None expected.
73 Workload Impact: No change from current situation.
74
75

2

1 San José State University
2 Academic Senate
3 Organization and Government Committee   **AS 1591**
4 November 2, 2015
5 Final Reading
6
7   **Senate Management Resolution**
8   **Amend Senate Standing Rule: Senate Meeting Agenda**
9
10 Legislative History: New proposal to amend Standing Rule 7 regarding the Senate
11 Meeting Agenda.
12
13 Whereas: The Standing Rules of the Academic Senate, Standing Rule 7a (Form of
14   Agenda) requires that the agenda item State of the University
15   Announcements immediately precede the adjournment of the meeting,
16   and
17
18 Whereas: Flexibility in the organization of the agenda could facilitate effective
19   management of senate business, and
20
21 Whereas: Recent experimentation with modifying the agenda has been found to be
22   helpful in providing needed time for policy items, and
23
24 Whereas: Adjusting the Standing Rules of the Academic Senate, Standing Rule 7a
25   (Form of Agenda) to allow the Executive Committee to determine the
26   placement of State of the University Announcements would provide the
27   flexibility needed to accommodate agendas with varying demands
28   throughout an academic year, therefore be it
29
30 Resolved: That Standing Rule 7 be modified as described below to allow the Senate
31   Executive Committee to determine the placement in the agenda for the
32   State of the University Announcements, and be it further
33
34 Resolved: That this change become effective with the passage of this Senate
35   Management Resolution.
36
37 Rationale: The Academic Senate, in an attempt to efficiently work through all
38 announcements, policy reviews, and other agenda items, has found it helpful to adjust
39 the agenda so that State of the University Announcements, with a time limit, follows
40 Communications and Questions. While this modification can be done at the time of a
41 meeting with a suspension requiring a two-thirds (2/3) majority vote at every meeting, it
42 would best serve the Senate to allow the Executive Committee the option of moving
43 State of the University Announcements as needed on the agenda. Presently standing
44 rule 7 places the state of the university announcements at the end of the Senate
45 Agenda.
46

1

```
47
48   Approved:          10/26/15
49   Vote:              7-0-0
50   Present:           Grosvenor, Laker, Curry, Shifflett, Gleixner, Becker, Beyersdorf
51   Absent:            Mathur, El-Miaari
52   Financial Impact:  None
53   Workload Impact:   None
54
55
56   Amendment to Standing Rule 7:
57
58       1. Form of agenda:
59          a) Outline of Agenda:
60            I.    Call to Order and Roll Call
61            II.   Approval of Minutes
62            III.  Communications and Questions
63                    1.   From the Chair of the Senate
64                    2.   From the President of the University
65            IV.   Executive Committee Report
66                    1.   Minutes of Executive Committee
67                    2.   Consent Calendar
68                    3.   Executive Committee Action Items
69            V.    Unfinished Business
70            VI.   Policy Committee, and University Library Board Action Items. In rotation.
71                  (Information items to be submitted in writing or by e-mail and included with
72                  the agenda.)
73            VII.  Special Committee Reports
74            VIII. New Business
75            IX.   State of the University Announcements. Questions. In rotation. (Detailed
76                  reports, if necessary, to be submitted in writing or by e-mail and included
77                  with the agenda)
78                    1.   Provost
79                    2.   Vice President for Administration and Finance
80                    3.   Vice President for Student Affairs
81                    4.   Vice President for University Advancement
82                    5.   CSU Senators
83                    6.   Associated Students President
84          X. Adjournment
85
86          b) Ordering of Agenda Items
87   At the discretion of the Executive Committee the order of the agenda with respect to the
88   State of the University Announcements may be modified and time limits set on the
89   presentation of information.
90
91          c) System of Rotation:
```

92 For purposes of Standing Rule 7.a) VI., "rotation" shall be applied as follows: Committee
93 order will be rotated for each meeting, so that the committee last in order at one
94 meeting shall be called on first at the next meeting. For the current academic year,
95 2015-2016, each committee shall present only one action item at a time. When each
96 committee has been called on, the chair shall then call again on the committee first in
97 the day's order for one additional action item, and so on.
98

San Jose State University
Academic Senate
Organization and Government Committee   **AS 1592**
November 2, 2015
Final Reading

Senate Management Resolution
Modification of Graduate Studies and Research Committee Membership.

Legislative History: Modifies SM-S96-5 which established the membership for the Graduate Studies and Research Committee. This senate management resolution was modified by S98-2 and resulted in updates to the charge of the Graduate Studies and Research Committee. SM-F08-3 then added to the membership of the Graduate Studies and Research Committee an Ex Officio seat for the Director of Sponsored Programs, SJSU Research Foundation or designee.

Whereas: Administrative changes have resulted in the creation of two new offices (Office of Graduate & Undergraduate Programs and Office of Research) from what was the Office of Graduate Studies and Research (GS&R), and

Whereas: The responsibilities of the Graduate Studies and Research Committee include matters specific to the conduct of research; and

Whereas: A representative from the Office of Research would be able to make substantive contributions to the work, particularly in research-based areas, of the Graduate Studies and Research Committee, therefore be it

Resolved   That an Ex officio seat for the Associate Dean, Office of Research be added to the Graduate Studies and Research Committee.

Rationale: The reorganization of the GS&R into the Office of Graduate & Undergraduate Programs and Office of Research leaves the GS&R Committee with the Associate Dean for Graduate and Undergraduate Programs (GUP) as the representative of the former Office of GS&R. This position represents only the Graduate Studies component of the former GS&R Office (under its new affiliation as representative from GUP) while the committee's responsibilities extend beyond curricula to include matters such as facilitating the development, administration, promotion and recognition of research at SJSU; the review of organized research and training units; and the review of student applications for research-based awards. Hence, the need to add a representative from the Office of Research to the GS&R Committee.

Approved: 10/19/15
Vote: 6-0-0
Present: Mathur, Laker, Shifflett, Fujimoto, Gleixner
Absent: Grosvenor, El-Miaari, Curry

47
48 Financial Impact: None expected.
49 Workload Impact: No change from current situation as the Associate Dean, Office of
50   Research, has been participating as a guest to the GS&R
51   Committee.
52
53 Graduate Studies & Research Committee Membership:
54
55   Coordinator, Library Collection (EXO)
56   Associate Dean, Graduate Studies (EXO)
57   Associate Dean, Research (EXO)
58   Director of Sponsored Programs (or designee) (EXO)
59   1 faculty member Applied Sciences & Arts
60   1 faculty member Business
61   1 faculty member Education
62   1 faculty member Engineering
63   1 faculty member General Unit
64   1 faculty member Humanities & Arts
65   1 faculty member Science
66   1 faculty member Social Sciences
67   2 Graduate Students
68