

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE

2015/2016

Agenda

November 30, 2015, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm

Engineering 285/287

- I. Call to Order and Roll Call –**
- II. Approval of Minutes –**
Senate Minutes of November 2, 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. Vice President for University Advancement
 - B. Statewide Academic Senators
 - C. Provost
 - D. Vice President for Administration and Finance
 - E. Vice President for Student Affairs
 - F. Associated Students President
- V. Executive Committee Report**
 - A. Minutes of the Executive Committee –
Exec. Minutes of October 26, 2015
Exec. Minutes of November 9, 2015
 - B. Consent Calendar –
 - C. Executive Committee Action Items –
- VI. Unfinished Business –**
- VII. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action Items (In rotation):**
 - A. University Library Board (ULB):
 - B. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
AS 1595, Policy Recommendation, Amending F15-5 (Final Reading)
 - C. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
AS 1589, Policy Recommendation, Attendance and Participation (Final Reading)
 - D. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

- E. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
AS 1585, Policy Recommendation, Updating the Board of General Studies Membership, Charge, and Responsibilities (Final Reading)

AS 1593, Senate Management Resolution, Assessment of Core Competencies (First Reading)

AS 1588, Policy Recommendation, Faculty Athletics Representative Policy (First Reading)

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

AS 1594, Policy Recommendation, Update of Policy on Selection and Review of Administrators (First Reading)

VIII. Special Committee Reports:

IX. New Business:

X. Adjournment:

Consent Calendar 2015-2016					
November 30, 2015					
Policy Committees					
COMMITTEE	NAME	UNIT	TERM	NOTES	
Operating Committees					
COMMITTEE	NAME	UNIT	TERM		
Undergraduate Studies	Beverly Grindstaff	Humanities & the Arts	2018		
Other Committees					
COMMITTEE	NAME	UNIT	TERM		
University Library Board	Jerry Wilburn	Undergraduate Student	2016		
Remove:					
COMMITTEE	NAME	UNIT	TERM		
Program Planning	Jennifer Dinalo	General Unit	2017		
Graduate Studies & Research	Jeanne Dittman	Director Sponsored Pgms (or designee)	EXO		

Senate Executive Committee Meeting Agenda
ADM 167, Noon to 1:30 p.m. (Lunch Provided)
October 26, 2015

1. Approval of EC Minutes of October 12, 2015
2. Selection of faculty members for the library dean search
3. College of Business Decanal search committee composition; adding a dean
4. Campus safety follow-up discussion
5. Transfer student admission criteria-role of departments
6. Remote meeting attendance resolution (Bethany)
7. SOS resolution re: representation on presidential search advisory committees

Time Permitting

8. Updates
 - a. President
 - b. Provost
 - c. VP Student Affairs
 - d. VP Administration and Finance
 - e. University Advancement
 - f. Library Board
 - g. AS
9. Policy Committee Updates
 - a. O & G
 - b. C & R
 - c. P S
 - d. ISA

Executive Committee Meeting Minutes
ADM 167, Noon to 1:30 p.m.
October 26, 2015

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

Absent: None

1. Approval of EC Minutes of October 12, 2015.

M/S/To approve the minutes with corrections of October 12, 2015. Vote: 11-0-2

2. Consent Calendar

M/S/To approve the consent calendar dated October 26, 2015. Vote: 13-0-0

3. Selection of faculty members for the library dean search

M/S/To defer the selection of the library dean search until after the results of the library selection on November 6, 2015. Vote: 13-0-0

Chair Kimbarow will send out an additional call for student nominees for the search committee.

M/S/To reopen the recruitment for all nominees for the search committee with a deadline of November 9, 2015. Vote: 14-0-0

4. College of Business Decanal search committee composition; adding a dean to the search committee

There is a new search for the Dean of the College of Business. According to S06-3, "The search committees for college deans shall be composed of nine members: three tenured faculty who are not department chairs, elected by and from the college faculty (but not more than one from any department); two department chairs from the college, elected by its department chairs; one staff member, elected by the staff of the college; one tenured faculty member from another college, designated by the Provost; one student, and one member of the community, each designated by the Provost."

There was a discussion about the request to add a dean to the search committee. This issue was added to the referral to Organization & Government for S06-3.

5. Campus safety follow-up discussion

There was a discussion in the College of Science about the panic buttons that used be under the desks. When the Executive Committee talked to Terri Vahey last year, she indicated that there was a plan to add the feature to the phones.

Interim VP Larochelle discussed the plans in Administration & Finance about three safety projects: VoIP Silent Alarm, Building Interior Mass Notification, and Rave

Guardian Safety App. Interim VP Larochele distributed a handout about these three projects to the committee. A&F is pushing to have the VoIP Silent Alarm implemented by the end of the Fall 2015 semester. The hard-wired panic alarms will be tested and will still be used in certain locations.

Building Interior Mass Notification: A&F is working on implementing this project as well. There is a gap in the classrooms regarding the notification systems. The classrooms have the analog phones which don't have the capability for this notification system.

Rave Guardian Safety App: This is a mobile safety app that faculty and staff can use.

Blue light phones: there is a gap on South campus with blue light phones. There is also a gap for camera surveillance. There are many camera systems used on campus, but there is not a centralized place for most of these cameras. For example, housing has cameras but the data is saved on a computer in housing and is not accessible to UPD.

Training is lacking as well for building emergency and safety concerns. Interim VP Larochele is working with VP Lanning and communications on getting the word out. Senator Heiden noted that there were concerns about follow-up on security issues with departments. Senator Amante made a suggestion to include the rationale as to how these projects were selected. She asked whether A&F got student input into the projects. Senator Frazier also suggested that advantages and disadvantages be included. Senator Shifflett added that redundancy is important in any safety plans.

6. Transfer student admission criteria-role of departments

Chair Kimbarow gave some background on this item. For the last two years, the transfer threshold for incoming transfer students in his department, for example, seems to have been set by someone outside the department. Provost Feinstein described the process and the use of the eligibility index for freshmen and GPA for transfer students. Sharon Wiley is the person who handles this for the university. Senator Peter noted that the SJSU Academic Senate does not have a policy on admissions. Senator Lee noted there seems to be a disconnect between faculty and chairs and those who are making the decisions. Provost Feinstein is going to look into this issue.

SJSU has to meet its overall target set by the Chancellor's office. SJSU usually tries to make 104% of its majors. According to Provost Feinstein, there has to be a balance between the department's desires and the need for the university to meet its targets. If there is not sufficient room in the majors, then students will be admitted as undeclared; however, in general, undeclared majors have lower retention and graduation rates. SJSU does not appear to have a good process for managing the process for undeclared students to get into a major. Senator Shifflett noted that many departments have had this discussion already and this can be used as part of the enrollment management process.

7. Remote meeting attendance resolution (Senator Shifflett, Organization and Government Committee)

There was a discussion about the resolution. The Executive Committee made several suggestions about the proposed resolution.

8. Update: President Sue Martin

President Martin is continuing to meet members of the community.

Athletics: SJSU has won four games; it takes six games to be bowl-eligible.

Student issue: President Martin discussed the death that recently happened on campus. Both she and VP Reggie Blaylock were at the emergency room and talked to the parents. Pres. Martin and VP Blaylock worked closely with the family to schedule a campus vigil to honor the student. They reported the vigil was successful and provided family and friends an opportunity to celebrate and remember the student's life

9. Chair Kimbarow stated that the rest of the agenda will be deferred. The Chancellor will be making a visit to campus. There will be an open forum between 11 a.m. - Noon on November 4, 2015 in the Student Union Theater.

The meeting adjourned at 1:31 p.m. These minutes were taken by AVC Patricia Backer on October 26, 2015. These minutes were edited by Chair Kimbarow on October 27, 2015. The Executive Committee made edits and approved the minutes on November 9, 2015.

Senate Executive Committee Meeting Agenda
ADM 167, Noon to 1:30 p.m. (Lunch Provided)
November 9, 2015

1. Approval of EC Minutes of October 26 2015
2. Review of SM-F15-5
3. SOS Re: Increasing faculty, staff, and students appointed to Presidential Search Advisory Committees
4. Enrollment Management (Sharon Wiley & Marna Genes) 12:30 Time Certain
5. Spartan Thursday-Discussion

Time Permitting:

6. Reports
 - a. President
 - b. Provost
 - c. VP Student Affairs
 - d. VP Administration and Finance
 - e. University Advancement
 - f. Library Board
 - g. AS
7. Policy Committee Updates
 - a. O & G
 - b. C & R
 - c. P S
 - d. ISA

Executive Committee Meeting Minutes
ADM 167, Noon to 1:30 p.m.
November 9, 2015

Present: Kimbarow, Martin, Peter, Frazier, Shifflett, Feinstein,
Kaufman, Backer, Laroche, Lee, Mathur, Lanning, Heiden

Absent: Amante, Blaylock

1. The Executive Committee minutes of October 26, 2015 were approved as amended (9-0-0).
2. Updates from the Chair:
SJSU's Women's Soccer Team are the Mountain West Conference Championship and received the coach and player of the year awards.
3. The committee discussed and voted on changing the Senate Management (SM) Resolution passed by the Senate on November 2, 2015 into a Policy Recommendation. This SM Resolution dissolved the Heritage, Preservation and Public History Committee which was created by a policy and therefore needs to be rescinded by a policy (8-0-1).
4. Update on the Presidential Advisory Search Committee:
Twenty-One Senates have passed resolutions in favor of more open and transparent presidential elections, and 2 are pending. The committee discussed voted to table the Sense of the Senate Resolution requesting additional faculty on the Presidential Advisory Search Committee (12-0-0).
5. Associate Vice President (AVP) Marna Genes and AVP Sharon Willey gave an update on enrollment management. For fall 2015, there were 45,000 undergraduate applicants, of which 16,000 were transfer students. We admitted almost 10,000 transfers. We cannot admit all qualified students. Some students with a 2.0 GPA are not admitted. Most departments require at least a 2.5 GPA at this time. The committee discussed the list of GPA requirements for each department that was handed out. Many expressed concern they had never seen this document before and were unaware of the GPAs. AVP Wiley explained the minimum GPAs were produced by IEA when the university first requested an impact status in 2012. The committee will have a further dialog on GPA's in enrollment/impaction at a later date.
6. Campus-wide Spartan Pride Thursdays:
The committee discussed a proposal sent to Chair Kimbarow from Mariaelena Marcano asking for the Senate's support of Spartan Pride Thursday activities. VP Lanning had not previously seen the materials distributed and will consult with VP Blaylock and report back to the Executive Committee.

7. Updates:

a. From the President:

The President congratulated the Women's Soccer Team.

John Carlos will be honored at the San José Sports Hall of Fame.

SJSU awarded \$19,167 in financial aid on average to each eligible student.

SJSU awarded \$213 million in financial aid out of a possible \$427 million.

The average student debt is \$16,251 for an UG student at SJSU compared to the national average of \$29,400. This is approximately \$180 a month.

b. From the Vice President of University Advancement: No report.

c. From the Vice President of Student Affairs: No report.

d. From the University Library Board: No report.

e. From the Provost: No report.

8. The meeting adjourned at 1:29 p.m.

These minutes were taken and transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on November 9, 2015. The minutes were edited by Chair Kimbarow on November 16, 2015. The minutes were approved by the Executive Committee on November 16, 2015.

2015/2016 Academic Senate

MINUTES
November 2, 2015

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

Ex Officio:

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

CASA Representatives:

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

Administrative Representatives:

Present: Martin, Blaylock, Feinstein,
Larochelle, Lanning

COB Representatives:

Present: Sibley, Virick, Campsey

Deans:

Present: Green, Hsu, Jacobs, Stacks

EDUC Representatives:

Present: Mathur, Laker

Students:

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

ENGR Representatives:

Present: Backer, Sullivan-Green

Alumni Representative:

Present: Walters

SCI Representatives:

Present: Kaufman, Clements
Absent: White, Beyersdorf

Emeritus Representative:

Present: Buzanski

SOS Representatives:

Present: Peter, Curry, Wilson
Absent: Coopman

General Unit Representatives:

Present: Matoush, Medina
Absent: Kauppila

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–

The minutes of October 5, 2015 were approved as written (45-0-0).

III. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Kimbarow welcomed Senators and announced the Chancellor will be here Wednesday, November 4, 2015, for an open forum from 11 a.m. to noon in the Student Union.

The position description for the new President has been finalized and Chair Kimbarow asked the Chancellor to send it to everyone on campus. If the Chancellor doesn't send it out, Chair Kimbarow will.

B. From the President of the University –

Interim President Martin announced that she had moved into the President's house and

had over 1,000 trick or treaters on Halloween. It was a lot of fun to be a part of that.

The President and her cabinet are working on safety, critical facility, and classroom issues this year including what can we get done, what must done, and how we pay for it.

The President and the Provost are also looking at enrollment targets and are challenging these. There are some real bottlenecks in class availability for students delaying graduation. The Chancellor will be here on November 4, 2015, and the President and Provost will be speaking with him about this.

The President is also taking a look at fundraising.

The President and her cabinet will focus on strengthening the team, getting things done, and trying to enhance the campus as we move forward this year.

Questions:

Q: You mentioned trying to get some resources to deal with bottlenecks, can you explain exactly what you mean?

A: Money. We need about \$2.7 million. The Provost commented that the average unit load is about 12.4 units, and he and the President would like to see this increase to 13 units. You can't graduate in four years with 12 units. One of challenges in fixing this is the artificial cap on FTES. The Provost and President will speak with the Chancellor about this. The Provost hopes to increase the FTES allocated to our students by 1,000, but keep the headcount the same. However, we would not get any additional funding for this and would have to pay for it ourselves, so we are looking at what our priorities are on the campus. Interim President Martin commented that we have over 10,000 students that have over 90 credits.

Q: Do we have a good handle on how many students are taking classes that are not moving them towards graduation?

A: Provost Feinstein announced the average number of credits students have when they graduate is about 155. What this tells me is that students are taking a lot of classes they don't need to graduate. Many are probably taking classes just to keep their financial aid. Senator Sabalius noted that he was insulted by the idea that classes students take that they don't need for their degree are being considered a waste.

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

A. CSU Statewide Senators –

Senator Lee announced the CSU Statewide Senate will meet later this week and there isn't much to report at this time. However, out of the 23 campuses, 20 have a resolution on file now calling for more open Presidential Searches.

B. Provost –

Provost Feinstein announced the review committee for the AVP of Student Academic Success Services, Maureen Scharberg, has been charged. Dr. Ron Rogers was selected as the Chair of that committee, and they will have their report by the end of the semester.

The Dean of the Library staff and college nominees are due by the end of the week. The Senate Office put out a call for the two faculty outside of the Library seats on the search committee, as well as a call for nominations for a student representative. The call for nominations for the faculty and student seats has been extended through Monday, November 9, 2015. The Executive Committee will review and select these members at their November 16, 2015 Executive Committee meeting.

The Dean of the College of Business Search Committee college nominees are due Monday, November 9, 2015. The Provost is also looking for a faculty member outside the college, and he would like that faculty member to be a Senator. Interested Senators not from the College of Business were encouraged to make an appointment to speak with the Provost.

The Provost Office has a new Academic Spotlight blog. Provost Feinstein asked Senators to sign-up for the blog and to participate in it.

C. Vice President for Administration and Finance (VPAF) –

Interim Vice President Josee Larochelle announced that over 95 staff members were honored at the Staff Service Awards last Thursday in the Student Union. There were five staff members with 35 years of service.

The Run, Hide, Defend Workshops on campus will continue to be offered every semester.

Interim VP Larochelle is working with the University Police Department (UPD) and Facilities, Development, and Operations (FDO) on a Safety Master Plan.

D. Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA) –

Vice President Blaylock announced that the Career Center and Alumni Relations will offer the Linked-in Bus on November 4, 2015. The Linked-in Bus only attends a few campuses per year. Our students will have the opportunity from 10:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. to take head shots and get free profile advice. This service normally costs between \$250 and \$400, but our students will be able to attend for free.

On November 9, 2015, the on campus Veterans Office will celebrate Veteran's Day.

On November 3, 2015, the second of two conversations called Community Conversations—Creating a Safe and Inclusive Campus Climate will be held in the

Student Union Ballroom from 4:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

There is a meet and greet summit in which 55 colleagues from 12 of the local community colleges will be on campus this Friday, November 6, 2015. They will be here all day and we will be learning about updates to our supplemental applications to transfer students, articulation conversations, academic services, etc.

Questions:

Q: Would it be possible to have the information about the Linked-in Bus sent out via email to Senators?

A: VP Blaylock will send this information to Senators.

E. Associated Students President (AS):

Senator and Vice President of Associated Students, Josh Romero reported that AS had their Second Annual Haunted House. There were over 1,000 students in attendance and the line went from the front of the AS House to the Event Center at one point.

The two Homecoming Queens this year are Diana Garcia and Drew Warmesley.

The first students selected to receive the Gold Point Cards to take a faculty member to lunch have been selected.

AS is working on their AS Government restructure and hope to finish this by the end of the semester.

F. Vice President for University Advancement (VPUA):

The Tower Foundation Board Retreat was held last month and one of the top priorities for next year is identifying the next generation of board members. UA is actively seeking board members from the current membership, local community, our donor base, alumni, etc. The same is true for the Alumni Association Board.

UA is looking into firms to do an assessment and feasibility study for a future comprehensive fundraising campaign that will focus on both endowment building as well as capital needs.

UA recently hired a Senior Development Director for the College of Business and his name is Bradley Bartan. He will begin working November 16, 2015. UA is just now launching a search for a new Director of Planned Giving.

The next issue of Washington Square will be distributed throughout the campus by the end of November/beginning of December.

There are 56 new "My Story" Banners coming out that feature student, alumni, faculty, and donor stories. Stories associated with the banners will also be posted on the website.

The Student Union will also get additional artwork delivered in December in anticipation of the opening of the rest of the Student Union in early Spring.

V. Executive Committee Report –

A. Executive Committee Minutes –

Exec. Minutes of September 28, 2015 – No questions.

Exec. Minutes of October 12, 2015 – No questions.

B. Consent Calendar –

A motion was made and seconded to approve the consent calendar. **The Senate voted and the consent calendar of November 2, 2015 was approved (45-0-0).**

Senator Peter introduced Dean Walt Jacobs a new Senator from the College of Social Sciences.

C. Executive Committee Action Items: None

VI. Unfinished Business - None

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

A. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) – No Report

B. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) –

Senator Kaufman presented *AS 1582, Policy Recommendation, Academic Integrity (Final Reading)*.

Senator Kaufman presented an amendment that was friendly to change lines 132-134 to read, “San José State University defines cheating as the act of obtaining credit, attempting to obtain credit, or assisting others to obtain credit for academic work through the use of any dishonest, deceptive, or fraudulent means.”

Senator Kaufman presented an amendment to lines 355 and 356 to read, “Academic standing shall revert to the standing that would have existed if the sanction had not been imposed.” The amendment was seconded. **The Senate voted and the Kaufman amendment passed (45-0-0).**

Senator Heiden presented an amendment that was friendly to change line 143 to read, **“1.1.3 submitting work simultaneously presented in two or more courses...”**.

Senator Sibley presented an amendment that was friendly to change lines 144-145 to read, **“prior approval of all course instructors or by the departmental policies of all departments;”**

Senator Heiden presented an amendment to line 345 to read, “determined by the BAFPR, a request to the President, Provost or appropriate vice president can be made by the

student, faculty member, or chair to expedite the resolution.” The amendment was seconded. Senator Laker presented an amendment to the Heiden amendment that was friendly to change line 345 to read, “determined by the BAFPR, a request to the President, Provost or appropriate vice president can be made by the BAFPR Chair and/or student.” **The Senate voted and the Heiden/Laker amendment passed (45-0-0).**

Senator Heiden called the question on debate. **The Senate voted and the motion passed (45-0-0).**

The Senate voted and AS 1582 passed as amended (45-0-0)

Senator Kaufman presented *AS 1589, Policy Recommendation, Attendance and Participation (First Reading)*.

One of our oldest policies still in effect is F69-24 called “Attendance,” and it says attendance can’t be used as a means of grading students. Despite this policy being on the books, the Student Fairness Committee (SFC) has seen a number of cases in which students are graded on things that require students to be in class without clearly stating what percentage of the grade, or how it will be assessed, etc. This referral came to I&SA for us to update the Attendance policy to clearly reflect that participation is different than attendance, and that if you are going to grade on participation you have to be clear about how you are going to do so such as by specifying what percentage of the grade will be based on participation.

Questions:

Q: I know a faculty member that grades on participation and participation is “showing up” so how is that different than attendance?

A: That would be specifically not allowed by this policy and your colleague should not do this. The existing policy states that attendance by itself cannot be used as an item for grading.

Q: Would the committee consider allowing attendance as something that can be graded on, and if not, why not?

A: To the best of my knowledge, there is nothing in Title V, statute, etc. that says we cannot grade on attendance. However, it has been a 46 year policy at this campus. This referral was to make a determination on the difference between attendance and something gradable. The committee will consider this.

Q: For instance, how can you gauge participation in large classes? I think grading on attendance in those classes would be something you might like to use.

A: In our large classes, we use clickers to get feedback and identify participation in the class.

Q: Has the committee considered putting in sample language that might be acceptable?

A: Yes, in an earlier draft we had example language, but we decided that we don’t have written lists that say what things you can use to grade on, so why should we have

examples of participation you can use to grade on.

Q: If my greensheet indicates that $\frac{1}{2}$ of all examinations are based on the assigned reading and the other $\frac{1}{2}$ is based entirely on the lectures and class activities, is that legal according to the new policy?

A: My understanding is that it is.

Q: Am I correct that students would have the right to challenge it if the student feels it says participation in the greensheet, but it really means attendance?

A: They currently have the right to do this, but despite that the SFC is still getting cases where you sit in a seat and the faculty member is checking off a box that you are there.

Q: Why are we rescinding F69-24 when the resolved clause re-states that attendance can't be used as a criteria for grading. Why not just modify F69-24? The reason I ask is that I use this for teaching and when students ask why they can't be graded on attendance, I tell them this goes back to when students were protesting heavily in the 1960's, some faculty were busting their chops by flunking them. That is why this policy was created. I think we are sort of gutting our institutional memory by rescinding F69-24. If you want to modify it, I would be for that and I do use participation in my grading.

A: Thank you. I was not aware of that history and will bring that back to the committee for consideration.

Q: Has the committee considered how they are defining participation, because I believe exemplars are needed?

A: Yes, there was quite a bit of discussion about this. The things that were listed in the draft were thought to be too narrow a set and the committee was unwilling to try and draft an exhaustive list, but we will certainly come back to this question in committee.

Q: With regard to participation vs. attendance, I'm thinking of oral communication classes where it is vital that they have a live audience when students are giving speeches. I think we need to be very careful in defining participation in such a way that it will be inclusive of courses that demand live audiences such as oral communication classes. I was told the origin of this policy was that there was one department giving out "A's" merely for showing up for class. There was a big surprise when it was reprinted in the catalog and people thought it was a prohibition on subtracting from the grade for lack of attendance. I was told it was the Physical Education Department at the time that just graded on attendance alone. For decades I have heard that the intent of the original policy was misinterpreted.

A: I'll have to defer to others on that. The referral came to us specifically from the SFC because cases were coming to them of faculty grading on just being in the seat. My reading of F69-24 is that you cannot be graded on just being in the seat. We now seem to have two origin stories for this policy.

Q: We have a credit hour policy on the syllabi that requires that students attend classes as $\frac{1}{3}$ rd of the credit for university coursework mandated by the federal government. The

other issue is student success where we know that attendance in class is a fundamental ingredient for success at a university. This policy, the old one, has always upset me as a faculty member, because I can't give credit where credit is due. The new policy doesn't upset me as much, but it does still upset me. I'm wondering if the committee would consider just rescinding the old policy?

A: The committee will consider it, but I can't tell you how the committee will respond.

Q: I wonder how this policy corresponds with the policy we just passed in terms of being able to get credit for coursework simply by exam which seems to imply that one does not need to participate. There are a range of students and methodologies that are available to the students and there may be alternative ways of getting information other than just by attendance, except where the faculty member does believe that participation is a very integral part of the class. Was it one of the things that was under consideration by C&R when they were thinking about the courses you could challenge that they were under the purview of the department as to when you need participation and when you do not?

A: It did not come up in C&R discussions at all.

Q: I had a class where they did grade on participation, but it was a Kinesiology class and there wasn't much else to grade on. You started with 100 points and lost 2 points every time you missed a class.

A: So if you have showed up for the classes and didn't dance, would they have done the same thing?

Q: If you just said your name and you were there you got two points.

A: That sounds like it is outside of policy. I would hope you would get credit in a course for more than just showing up.

Q: Does the current or proposed policy preclude a situation where a course has participation as a grade criterion, but the student that is on the cusp of the next higher grade is given that grade because they showed up, or would that situation run afoul of the current or new policy?

A: I think it would run afoul of the policy, because just showing up is not gradable.

Q: I can't help but recall the establishing a committed presence in a class policy and how strange this is that in terms of refunds, tuition, and financial matters we have a policy stipulating you must show up, but we can't grade on attendance.

A: As far as the committed presence policy is concerned, a significant chunk of that is to make room for students that want to get into the class, and there is someone that shows no interest in being in the class.

Q: Did you consider that when Senator Stacks asked the question about credit by examination that those students don't get any unit credit and that makes a lot of difference if you are getting unit credit for a course to which you are enrolled then you should show up?

A: I believe that question was asked during the debate over the credit by exam policy. It was not something that was in the purview of I&SA, but that is a fair point.

Q: Has the committee considered that when it comes to students and attendance, if the student doesn't want to go to class it should be their choice?

A: The point of this policy is to say that if you are going to grade on being in the classroom, you need to make it clear this is the case. This way students can make an informed decision about whether to show up or not.

C. Professional Standards Committee (PS) – No report.

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

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1591, Senate Management Resolution, Amend Senate Standing Rule: Senate Meeting Agenda (Final Reading)*.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to change line 41 to add, “of the rules” after “meeting with a suspension.”

The Senate voted and AS 1591 passed as amended (45-0-0).

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1592, Senate Management Resolution, Modification of Graduate Studies and Research Committee Membership (Final Reading)*.

Questions:

Q: Have you considered changing the acronym of “GUP” to something else?

A: The office is called Graduate and Undergraduate Programs. The Provost will consider this.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to change the vote to 5-0-0.

The Senate voted and AS 1592 was approved as amended (45-0-0).

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1586, Policy Recommendation, Modification of Human Subjects Institutional Review Board Membership (Final Reading)*.

Senator Backer presented an amendment that was friendly to add commas where appropriate to lines 80-82 to read, “(4) When there are multiple applications for any seat, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate will select individuals to serve. In considering potential IRB-HS members, attention should focus on the person’s research skills and....”

Senator Backer presented an amendment that was friendly to remove “CITI (Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative)” from line 71-72 and line 74. Senator Van Selst presented an amendment to the Backer amendment that was friendly to replace “online CITI (Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative) with “approved” on lines 71-72 and “approved IRB reviewer” on line 74.

Senator Van Selst presented an amendment that was friendly to replace “attending the” on line 75 to “voting at their.”

The Senate voted on AS 1586 as amended and it passed (45-0-0).

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1587, Senate Management Resolution, Dissolving the Heritage, Preservation, and Public History Committee (Final Reading)*.

The Senate voted and AS 1587 was approved (44-1-0).

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1579, Policy Recommendation, Budget Advisory Committee (Final Reading)*.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to add another resolved clause at line 46 to read, “Resolved: That SM-S03-1 be rescinded since reporting responsibilities are part of this policy recommendation.”

The Senate voted and AS 1579 was approved as amended (43-0-2).

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

Senator Heiden presented an amendment that was friendly to the last sentence in line 44 to change “policy recommendation” to “policy.”

Senator Peter presented an amendment that was friendly to add a new section 1.4.6 to read as follows:

“1.4.6. The Board may appoint General Education Advisory Panels (GEAPs). Each GEAP shall be focused on a specific curricular requirement or set of requirements that is under the purview of the Board. The creation of GEAPs shall be at the discretion of the Board, except for the American Institutions GEAP which is required.

1.4.6.1 Purpose. A GEAP shall provide the Board with advice drawn from disciplinary expertise and may assist the Board with the workload associated with reviewing and assessing courses associated with a particular curricular requirement.

1.4.6.2 Membership. The membership of Advisory Panels shall be determined by the Board but shall be no less than three persons, and shall consist of individuals with subject-matter expertise and teaching experience relevant to the particular curricular requirement.

1.4.6.3 American Institutions. The American Institutions GEAP shall include, at a minimum, a representative with a doctorate in Political Science who specializes in American and California Government, a representative with a doctorate in History who

specializes in United States History, and a representative who has taught American Institutions requirements in an interdisciplinary context outside of the Political Science and History departments. The AI panel may advise the Board on the GE content of curricular proposals that seek to meet both AI and GE requirements. The AI panel shall make the determination whether such proposals meet AI requirements.”

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the Peter amendment to add “specific proposals pertaining to certification or continuing certification” in line 249.

Senator Van Selst presented an amendment that was friendly to change the Peter/Shifflett amendment to section 1.4.4.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to lines 253 and 254 to strike the last sentence that reads, “The AI panel shall make the determination whether such proposals meet AI requirements.”

A motion was made to postpone debate to the next meeting. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the motion was approved (45-0-0).

E. University Library Board (ULB) – None

VIII. Special Committee Reports –

Interim VP of Administration and Finance, Josee Larochelle gave the University Budget highlights presentation for 2015-2016 and introduced Bradley Olin, the new University Budget & Risk Management Director

The state fully funded the CSU support budget for this year to the tune of \$216 million. This was a tremendous feat for the CSU. It has been about a decade since the state fully funded the CSU support budget as requested. This amounted to about \$96 million more than what was in the Governor’s original budget proposal.

Questions:

Q: Could you explain what the support budget is for those that haven’t attended one of these budget presentations before?

A: Sure, the support budget is the amount of funds requested by the CSU Chancellor’s Office and Board of Trustees from the State of California as part of the State of California appropriation to support higher education as provided by the CSU.

What this meant for SJSU is that we did receive 3% enrollment growth for this fiscal year. Also, the CSU was able to fund compensation increases for this year. This year our self-supporting programs also have good financial footing. Self-supporting programs are programs that charge a fee for something such as housing, parking, student health, and counseling. This means they have a balanced budget and they have some funds available to be put aside for improvements, deferred maintenance, expansion, etc.

In the 2014-2015 fiscal year, the state legislature provided a new capital financing framework for the CSU. Each California State University is now responsible for maintaining our capital infrastructure—our buildings. We no longer participate in the state general obligation bond program. With that responsibility, we now have the authority to create a campus reserve program. In the past, that reserve program was restricted and monitored significantly because the state prohibited CSU campuses from creating what appeared to be huge cash reserves without an intended purpose. Now that the state is no longer financing CSU infrastructure directly, we can increase our reserve to support buildings on campus, whether it is maintenance, repair, or new construction.

The campus priorities that were funded for this fiscal year include putting aside funds for our buildings and infrastructure as well as \$2 million in one-time funds for the campus reserve. We have over a \$300 million operating budget and we do not have any designated reserves. Base funding on this campus is permanent reoccurring funding. One-time funds are just that, one time funds provided for a specific purpose or intent. These are not funded every year.

Questions:

Q: Could you explain the Athletics funding of \$1.6 million?

A: The campus funded \$1.6 million identified as total cost of attendance for Athletics. What this really should say is funding to support our student athletes. The \$1.6 million in one-time funds are only for this year and is dedicated to funding scholarships for student athletes to reflect the full cost of attendance. The full cost of attendance includes items over and above the financial aid component previously there. It pays for things like additional meals, books, driving time, etc. NCAA has modified and increased the cost that should be provided to student athletes based on the limited time these students have outside of meeting academic and athletic obligations..

Q: Why is it one-time? Is the cost going to go down next year?

A: No, however, Athletics has been challenged with fundraising in order to support this permanent need. Athletics is working with UA to see if they can increase their financial support from our donor base for our athletes.

Q: If they don't increase their fundraising, then will they have to have another \$1.6 million next year?

A: Correct.

Q: In one of the previous slides you show that the percentage of the operating budget going to Intercollegiate Athletics is at 2.8%. Is that \$1.6 million in addition to the 2.8%?

A: It is included in the 2.8%

Q: Why is it 2.8%? Weren't we supposed to stick with 2% maximum?

A: There was a past agreement with a past President and the Academic Senate that discussed that 2%. We have not been at the 2.0% since before Interim VP Larochelle's arrival at SJSU.

The last slide is a pie chart that identifies the percentages across the division of our operating fund.

Questions:

Q: We have a policy recommendation coming before the Senate today to establish a Budget Advisory Committee. Let's say that passes and we put a call out this semester and it convenes in January 2016, what will they be working on as far as the budget is concerned? What can they weigh in on?

A: They will be able to weigh in on the budget this year and next year. If the BAC gets started in January, the President's cabinet will be working on finalizing the budget plan for the next fiscal year, 2016-2017. The BAC members would be able to understand what our priorities are as well as what our budgeted and targeted student enrollment will be.

Q: I have several questions. Where did the money come from for the severance package that was given to President Qayoumi? Where did the money come from to pay for the \$500,000 to \$1 million in stolen Information Technology equipment? Is there any clarification about the Superbowl team practices on campus and whether that will generate any income for us?

A: The University projects and estimates the number of students we will teach during the year as well as the state appropriations we can expect from the Chancellor. Then we have an expenditure plan associated with that plan's revenue. This is where the funding for President Qayoumi's severance package came from. This was an unplanned expenditure that had to be appropriately paid for out of the operating fund budget. Is your second question who pays for the lost equipment?

Q: Yes, my understanding is that IT equipment that was part of the CISCO agreement and amounted to between \$500,000 and \$1 million that was delivered to campus then stolen. Do we have insurance to cover this?

A: Yes. The original purchase of the equipment totaled \$28 million and came partly from the the operating budget and some CERF funds. We are still negotiating with the insurance company on reimbursing us. We are hopeful we will recover some of our funds.

Q: Has any of the original equipment been recovered at all?

A: No, and the individual charged with the crime is still incarcerated.

Q: Why do we not get a printout of the budget any longer? It is difficult to explain my questions without the report. Please go to page 25. The Athletics Division has a total budget of about \$26 million. The Athletics Division earns about \$10 million of this budget, so where does the other \$16 million in subsidies come from? It comes from the operating fund, which was supposed to be limited to 2% but is now almost 3% at about \$8 million, and the student fees, which account to another \$8.25 million. We should be outraged by these numbers. The Athletics Division costs us so much money. The reason we had the old agreement limiting the amount of funds given to the Athletics Division to 2% was because we had a group called "Spartans for Sanity" led by Dr. James Brent, a former Senate Chair. We had a campus referendum asking whether we should pull out of Division 1A football to save the campus money. Over 3/4 of the faculty voted for it. In order not to go to that and have a student referendum and have to explain to the students that each student pays about \$260, if not more, for Athletics, the President and the Senate agreed that the Athletics budget would not exceed 2% of the operating fund. It is an outrage that we subsidize the Athletics Division to the tune of \$16 million each year. The budget for our largest college is only approximately \$20 million. Then on Page 28, which lists the SSETF fees, you see that out of the \$10 million collected from students, \$8.25 million goes to Athletics. If I were a student I would think this is not right. My first question is where the \$8

million in one-time funds comes from? My second question is: where is the breakdown of the how the Athletics funds are spent? They can't possibly end each year at exactly \$0. Either we should stick to our 2% cap on the amount of the operating fund that goes to Athletics, or we should reopen this matter and inform students how much of their money is going to Athletics.

A: When Athletics started this year, they had a balanced budget. The past few years have been a challenge for our Athletics Director and our Athletics Program. This is the first year out of the past four years that they do not have a planned deficit at year end and hope to end the year at \$0 balance. The one-time funds are generated by excess enrollment or over our target. We budget fees as one-time for any student over our base targeted FTES.

Q: By the time President Kassing left, the percentage of the operating budget given to Athletics had went up to 2.3%. President Kassing had come to the Senate with the justification that the cost of tuition had went up and that was the initial .3% increase. That was many years ago. The increase from 2.3% to the 2.8% is probably due to the increase in the cost of attendance for students. For those not familiar with cost of attendance, this is a nationwide thing that recognizes that athletes do not have time to take part-time jobs. They were running at a deficit, because they were putting in a lot of hours without the part-time job and had lots of expenses related to attendance that were not covered in their scholarship, so they extended the scholarships to include additional things like meals and transportation. With the SSETF, it is important for everyone to know that the students had extensive consultation and meetings about SSETF fees and their distribution and they made pretty specific recommendations which were followed. Part of the confusion here comes from when the SSETF was lumped into one fee. The IRA and course support fees have always been there. The first four listed on the chart are new fees. The IRA and course support fees should not be listed as if they are new SSETF fees. The IRA and course support fees were agreed to by students many, many years ago.

Q: While I share the outrage over the funds given to Athletics, I am really outraged that the state of California only subsidizes the CSU at 42% and students are forced to pay 51%. That is outrageous and the students should rebel against this.

Q: Why is it that we are spending so much money on Athletics when students can't get the classes they need? Next semester one of my classes only has one section. Why can't some of this money be spent on additional classes?

A: SJSU has participated in NCAA Division 1A Athletics for many years and as an institution if we support Athletics Programs then we must provide support for them. Whether or not to have a Division 1A program would be a different question to ask.

Q: Why do we need to fund students that are athletes so they don't have to work, I have to work full-time and go to school full-time? It is ludicrous that we are giving Athletics \$8 million.

Q: Last year's pie chart showed that the amount given to Intercollegiate Athletics was only 2.1% of the operating fund while this year's percentage is 2.8%. I can't believe we jumped that much in one year. One of the charts must be wrong.

A: There is the \$1.6 million in one-time fees.

Q: There is another set of numbers provided by the Intercollegiate Athletics Division to the NCAA for last year, and those figures report higher amounts of operating fund and student fee

support than we were told. There is a \$2 million difference. Here we are again a year later and we have another disparity between what the Athletics Division is telling the NCAA and our budget report. Why is there a disparity?

A: These two reports are different in how they are generated. The difference has to do with one being a budget and the other being actuals. The NCAA also has the university report on university-funded items, such as the student athlete insurance. This isn't part of the Athletics budget and would appear under the University-Wide or Admin & Finance budget, but the NCAA wants to see that number.

Q: So what you are explaining is that parts of the budget allocated to other divisions outside of Intercollegiate Athletics is used to support Intercollegiate Athletics and the NCAA captures that from our reports?

A: Correct.

Q: On page 22, there is over \$19,000 for Study Abroad Programs. Is this \$19,000 distributed across all Study Abroad Programs, or is \$19,000 going to each Study Abroad Program?

A: Interim VP Larochelle will go back and get additional information regarding the Study Abroad Programs.

Q: What can the student government do going forward as related to limiting the SSETF Athletics fees? Should we survey the students?

A: There was a student survey done last year on SSETF fees.

Q: Yes, but it wasn't about the Athletics fee.

Q: Is there some kind of shift this year in the funds across divisions?

A: We did create a new division this year called the Office of Diversity and Inclusion. There are more funds going to Academic Affairs (AA) this year than last year. Last year AA got 56.6% and this year AA got 64.3%. Student Affairs got 5.9% last year and this year they got 6.5%. Administration and Finance got 12.3% last year and 13.7% this year. University Advancement (UA) got 2.1% last year and 2.3% this year. University-wide got 20.5% last year, and this year got 9.5%.

Q: So everyone went up except for this ambiguous category of University-wide.

A: Interim VP Larochelle will look into exactly why that happened and get back to the Senate with detailed information about this category.

Q: My understanding is that we get paid on an FTES basis by the CSU. Is this correct, or do we present a budget to the CSU?

A: No, we don't present a budget to the CSU. They give us what they think we should have. It is predicated on enrollment, but there are other things like compensation and benefits.

Q: We are one of three schools in Division 1A right? So, does the CSU give us more money per student because we are participating in an activity that requires stadiums, etc.

A: No.

Q: I just wanted to present a point of clarification. I think it is important for new Senators and Student Senators to be aware that the students voted previously on the SSETF fees, and the SSETF funds cannot go to increase classes. It is a designated fund and one of the conditions of

that fund was that it cannot be used for additional classes or to hire faculty, unless the Chancellor has changed this.

Chair Kimbarow announced to the Senate that he is considering a separate Senate meeting devoted entirely to the Budget next year to allow for more time for questions and discussion.

IX. New Business – None

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

San José State University
Academic Senate
Organization and Government Committee
November 30, 2015
Final Reading

AS 1585

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rationale: In the process of working on referrals that impact S02-7, it was noted that S96-9 had been superseded by S02-7. In addition, update of S02-7 was needed with respect to duplication of content in the 2014 Guidelines, references to CSU executive order 1100, and deletion of sections no longer relevant. Hence, this policy recommendation provides an update of University Policy with respect to the membership, charge, and responsibilities of BOGS and keeps the content of this policy distinct from information in the 2014 Guidelines for GE, AI, and GWAR.

The changes proposed brings policy language up to date to reflect our structure of seven rather than eight colleges and provides support, through addition of the Director

of Assessment, for the ongoing work of the Board with respect to the assessment of curricula and courses.

Summary of changes:

- Updates titles.
- Membership updates. BOGS shall consist of ten members: seven teaching faculty (representing seven colleges), one student, the AVP for Graduate & Undergraduate Programs or designee (EXO; non voting), and the Director of Assessment (EXO; non voting).
- Establishing a faculty chair. The Chair shall be a faculty member with at least one year of service on the Board.
- Modification with respect to voting. Ex officio members will be non-voting members with the exception that in the case of ties, the AVP for Graduate & Undergraduate Programs or designee may vote.
- Updates information related to the relevant CSU Executive Order.
- Updates policy to accurately reflect current practices in BOGS in alignment with the current GE, AI, and GWAR Guidelines.
- Adds to procedures section, including discipline-specific faculty, as needed, in discussions concerning proposals when the board determines additional expertise is needed.
- Adds to procedures section, provisions for the appointment of General Education Advisory Panels.

Approved: 11/16/15

Vote: 9-0-0

Present: Mathur, Shifflett, El-Miaari, Beyersdorf, Gleixner, Becker, Laker, Grosvenor, Curry

Absent: Beyersdorf

Financial Impact: None expected

Workload Impact: Additional short-term workload for individuals serving on a General Education Advisory Panel

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 receives and 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 evaluates modifications requested by degree programs in accordance with the 2014 Guidelines.

1.2 Membership

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

1.2.1 Election and Appointment of Members

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

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

1.2.1.3 The college curriculum committee shall select not more than three of those nominated to place before the college electorate. The college curriculum

committee may choose to meet and consult with the Provost (or designee) prior to making the selection.

1.2.1.4 Selection by each college curriculum committee shall be based on interest, competence, and experience in the General Education curricula; the statements prepared by departmental nominees shall be considered.

1.2.1.5. Faculty shall serve three-year staggered terms. When a full-term vacancy is to be filled, or a vacancy for an unexpired term of more than one year, applications shall be solicited from the college, and an election held as provided above.

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

1.2.1.7. A faculty member of the Board may be granted a leave for one semester. A one semester interim appointment may then be made as provided in 1.2.1.6.

1.2.1.8. If a college is unable to elect a faculty member to the Board, then the position will be filled for one year by the college curriculum committee in consultation with the Dean.

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

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

1.2.2 The Chair shall be a faculty member with at least one year of service on the Board. College faculty representatives through a vote will select the chair from among those with continuing appointments before the end of the spring semester for the subsequent year.

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

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

1.3 Responsibilities of the Board of General Studies

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

- 164 **1.3.2** Members are expected to know the current Guidelines for GE, AI, and GWAR.
- 165 **1.3.3** The Board shall actively solicit courses and curricular proposals designed to
166 satisfy General Education requirements from all colleges and departments of the
167 University, shall review, and where appropriate approve courses and curricular
168 proposals for purposes of General Education, and shall evaluate existing GE, AI, and
169 GWAR courses and curricula.
- 170 **1.3.4** The Board, in consultation with the appropriate college deans and department
171 chairpersons, shall provide for and approve modifications to requirements requested by
172 degree programs in accordance with the 2014 Guidelines.
- 173 **1.3.5** Policy proposals affecting General Education curricula shall be brought to the
174 Academic Senate by the Curriculum and Research Committee. The Organization and
175 Government Committee shall present policy proposals relating to charge, membership,
176 and responsibilities of BOGS.
- 177 **1.3.6** Annually, early in Fall Semester, the Board will provide for the Senate (through
178 Curriculum and Research Committee) a written report on its activities for the preceding
179 academic year.
- 180 **1.3.7** The Board shall, in consultation with the Director of Assessment and the Director
181 for Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics, develop and implement strategies for the
182 periodic evaluation of these core competencies: Information Literacy, Written
183 Communication, Oral Communication, Critical Thinking, and Quantitative Reasoning. If
184 there are policy or senate management implications that emerge, BOGS will bring
185 recommendations to the senate via the Curriculum & Research Committee for referral to
186 a policy committee as needed.
- 187 **1.3.8** In accordance with the 2014 Guidelines, BOGS is responsible for the assessment
188 and continuing certification of GE, AI, and GWAR courses.
- 189 **1.4 Procedures**
- 190 The following shall apply to the proceedings of BOGS:
- 191 **1.4.1** Meetings of the Board shall be open to the campus community, except in cases
192 where BOGS elects to conduct votes in closed session.
- 193 **1.4.2** Departmental representatives (normally course coordinators and chairs/directors)
194 shall be invited in a timely manner by BOGS to attend, as needed, Board meetings at
195 which their course(s) will be discussed. No vote to reject a proposal shall be taken until
196 departmental representatives have been invited to a discussion of their proposal.
- 197 **1.4.3** At the Board's discretion, discipline-specific faculty will be invited to participate in
198 discussions concerning proposals when the board determines additional expertise is
199 needed.

1.4.4 The Board may appoint General Education Advisory Panels (GEAPs). Each GEAP shall be focused on a specific curricular requirement or set of requirements that is under the purview of the Board. The creation of GEAPs shall be at the discretion of the Board, except for the American Institutions GEAP which is required. A GEAP will be an ad hoc group constituted for the short duration needed to review and subsequently advise the Board on specific proposals pertaining to certification or continuing certification.

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

1.4.4.2 Membership. The membership of Advisory Panels shall be determined by the Board but shall be no less than three persons, and shall consist of individuals with subject-matter expertise and teaching experience relevant to the particular curricular requirement.

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

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

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

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

2. Subsequent Review

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

San Jose State University
Academic Senate
Organization and Government Committee
November 30, 2015
First Reading

AS 1588

Policy Recommendation
Revision: Faculty Athletics Representative Policy

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

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

- Each member institution is required to appoint a faculty athletics representative. [Constitution 6.1.3]
- Qualifications of those who may serve as faculty athletics representatives are described in Constitution 6.1.3: A member institution shall elect an individual to serve as faculty athletics representative. An individual so designated after January 12, 1989, shall be a member of the institution's faculty or an administrator who holds faculty rank and shall not hold an administrative or coaching position in the athletics department. Duties of the faculty athletics representative shall be determined by the member institution.
- A faculty athletics representative is a member of an institution's faculty or administrative staff who is designated by the institution's president or chancellor or other appropriate entity to represent the institution and its faculty in the institution's relationships with the NCAA and its conference(s), if any. [Constitution 4.02.2]

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

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

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

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

Resolved: That the attached policy be adopted and implemented as soon as it is

approved by the President, and be it further

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

Rationale: Revisions are needed to clarify implementation language in the current policy. For example, existing policy states that "The term of the office shall be three years and may be renewed once with approval of the President in consultation with the Academic Senate Executive Committee." Although this seems to establish an explicit term limit, the current policy also states that "Additional years of service may be added if service on national committees result in a significant benefit to the University." There is a need to clarify the open-ended nature of this provision. Term limits provide the opportunity for a greater diversity of faculty to serve in this capacity and performance reviews provide a valuable check and balance to automatic reappointments and/or inadequate reviews. This policy revision also seeks to provide more information, not included in F05-2, with regard to the charge and responsibilities of the FAR.

Approved: 11/16/15

Vote: 9-0-0

Present: Mathur, Shifflett, Beyersdorf, Becker, Gleixner, El-Miaari, Laker, Curry, Grosvenor

Absent: Gleixner

Financial Impact: None expected.

Workload Impact: No change from current situation.

1. Faculty Athletics Representative Charge

To ensure the academic integrity of the athletics program, to serve as an advocate for student-athlete well-being, represent faculty perspectives on all aspects of our intercollegiate athletics program, and to play a part in maintaining institutional control of the athletics program. Particularly important components of this charge include informing the athletics department of faculty concerns and conferring on academic/athletic matters with administrators, faculty, students and/or alumni. The FAR will also be actively engaged in the four domains identified in the NCCA FAR report: academics, compliance/rules interpretation, student-athlete well-being, and administrative responsibilities (http://www.ncaa.org/sites/default/files/FAR_STUDY_Report_final.pdf; pg. 15).

2. Faculty Athletics Representative Responsibilities

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

2.1.1 The FAR must avoid both the reality and appearance of any conflict of interest, particularly in relationship to accepting perks or other fringe benefits from any individual, group, or agency connected to intercollegiate athletics.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.10 Assess, understand, and address faculty concerns regarding student athletes and our Intercollegiate Athletics Program.

2.11 Assess, understand, and address student-athlete concerns regarding academic issues.

2.12 Participate in the investigation and reporting of possible violations of Conference, NCAA, and institutional policies and rules.

2.13 Facilitate adherence to eligibility requirements.

2.14 Meet with the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee at least once a semester.

2.15 Work cooperatively with and support the work of the Associate Athletic Director for Compliance and contribute to the development of appeals, reports, and other correspondence to our Conference and the NCAA as outlined in NCAA and Conference Manuals. Faculty athletics representatives should play a central role in any major

institutional inquiries into alleged or suspected rules violations. They should be involved in the preparation of written reports of infractions that are made to our conference or to the NCAA.

2.16 Serve as an ex officio non-voting member of the University Athletics Board.

2.17 Represent SJSU as a delegate to NCAA Conventions and Conference meetings. Work cooperatively with the President, Athletic Director, Associate Athletic Director for Compliance, the faculty and others in developing the institution's position on proposals at NCAA Conventions and Conference meetings.

2.18 Annually administer the NCAA Division 1 Coaches exam.

2.19 Annually review the institution's Graduation Rates Report and Academic Progress Rates Report for each sport.

2.20 Prepare an annual report for the Academic Senate with information including, but not limited to, FAR activities, academic performance statistics, including graduation rates, for student-athletes, academic services for student-athletes, compliance/rules concerns, and responses to faculty concerns related to our intercollegiate athletics program.

2.21 Be a knowledgeable resource for the campus community with respect to NCAA and conference rules.

2.22 Play an active role "in the preparation of the institution's NCAA self-study report in each of the four basic areas, and play a leading role in the areas of academic integrity, governance and commitment to rules compliance, and commitment to equity, which includes student-athlete welfare." [FARA Handbook]

2.23 Work closely with the FAR-elect to prepare that person to effectively transition into their FAR role.

2.24 Fulfill any additional duties assigned by the President.

3. Recruitment and Appointment of the Faculty Athletics Representative

3.1 The Senate Chair, Chair of the Athletics Board and the President's Chief of Staff are responsible for establishing, regularly reviewing, and updating as needed, the position description for the FAR.

3.2 The FAR will serve a 3-year term. In extraordinary circumstances the FAR could be re-appointed for up to 2 years by the President. An example of a situation when an

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

Each group will forward its recommendations to the President's Chief of Staff who will arrange for the individuals nominated to be interviewed by the Chair of the Academic Senate, Chair of the Athletics Board, and the President. The President shall appoint a FAR following the interview process.

3.2.1 Reappointment of a FAR. Reappointment should not be automatic. Reappointment for up to 2 years would be appropriate in special cases where continuity is needed.

3.2.1.1 Timeline for re-appointments: At the conclusion of the second year of an initial 3-year term, the President would consult with the faculty members of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and the Athletics Board if considering the re-appointment of an incumbent FAR.

3.2.1.2 Review process. Following a decision to consider re-appointment of a FAR, the Chief of Staff would initiate and complete a review of the performance of the FAR in sufficient time to identify a FAR-elect if the incumbent is not re-appointed. Review of the performance of the FAR includes a review by the Athletics Board and faculty members of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, and input from other members of the Senate.

3.2.1.3 Reappointment. The president makes the final decision on re-appointment.

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

4. Recruitment and appointment of the FAR-elect.

At the start of the last year of a FAR's term, the Committee on Committees chair shall put out a call for applicants to serve as FAR-elect in the final semester of the FAR's

term and subsequently assume the FAR role. The selection and appointment process followed is that noted above in section 3.2.

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

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

Resources used in development of this policy:

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

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
Academic Senate
Instruction & Student Affairs Committee
November 30, 2015
Final Reading

AS 1589

**Policy recommendation:
Attendance and Participation**

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

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

Resolved: that F69-24 (Attendance) be rescinded.

Resolved: Attendance shall not be used as a criterion for grading.

Resolved: Students are expected to attend all meetings for the courses in which they are enrolled as they are responsible for material discussed therein, and active participation is frequently essential to ensure maximum benefit to all class members. In some cases, attendance is fundamental to course objectives; for example, students may be required to interact with others in the class. Attendance is the responsibility of the student.

Resolved: Participation may be used as a criterion for grading when the parameters and their evaluation are clearly defined in the course syllabus and the percentage of the overall grade is stated.

Approved: November 16, 2015

Vote: 14-1-0

Present: Walters, Sofish, Kaufman, Medina, Sen, Khan, Wilson,
Medrano, Gay, Abukhdeir, Amante, Campsey, Simpson,
Branz (non-voting), Bruck (non-voting), Rees, Brooks

Absent: Sullivan-Green

- 44 Curricular Impact: More clarity for students
- 45 Financial Impact: None
- 46 Workload impact: Fewer cases brought to the Student Fairness Committee

1 San Jose State University
2 Academic Senate
3 Organization and Government Committee
4 November 30, 2015
5 First Reading
6

AS 1590

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

permitted when appropriate and reliable resources are available and the work of the Senate will not be compromised.

Add by-law 10.3; g: Members of special agencies are expected to attend meetings in person. At the discretion of the chair remote attendance may be permitted when appropriate and reliable resources are available and the work of the committee will not be compromised.

Rationale: The option to attend meetings from a remote location is potentially beneficial in terms of morale and equity (e.g., balance domestic and work obligations, commuting distance). Given the expansion of technological tools that facilitate remote communication some amount of flexibility should be available regarding meeting attendance. However, at the same time, campus resources may not be robust or reliable enough, depending on the location, to make remote attendance feasible. In addition, the availability of technical support, or lack thereof, for committee chairs will likely influence the viability of remote attendance. Of utmost importance is the quality of the exchange of ideas and information among members thus in-person attendance should be the norm while allowing for exceptions in cases where it is clear that the work of the group will not be compromised.

Approved: 10/26/15

Vote: 6-1-0

Present: Laker, Shifflett, Beyersdorf, Becker, Gleixner, Curry, Grosvenor

Absent: El-Miaari, Mathur

Financial Impact: None expected.

Workload Impact: Potential increase for committee chairs with regard to planning, organization, and management of meetings.

San José State University
Academic Senate
Organization and Government Committee
November 30, 2015
First Reading

AS 1593

**Senate Management Resolution:
Assessment of Core Competencies**

Legislative History: New proposal related to the assessment of core competencies.

Whereas: Assessing each core competency identified and required by WASC at the university level is needed, and

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

Whereas: The Assessment facilitators group has the experience necessary to facilitate wide-ranging dialogues with faculty regarding methods, procedures, and the infrastructure needed to develop and implement strategies to evaluate core competencies, therefore be it

Resolved That the assessment facilitators group, under the leadership of the Director of Assessment, shall consult with a wide range of campus groups (e.g., UCCD, BOGS, Associated Students) to obtain input on our approach to the assessment of core competencies. Subsequently, the assessment facilitators will develop a proposal to present to the Curriculum and Research Committee regarding strategies for the periodic assessment of these core competencies: Information Literacy, Written Communication, Oral Communication, Critical Thinking, and Quantitative Reasoning. If there are policy or senate management implications that emerge, Curriculum and Research will bring recommendations to the senate for referral to a policy committee as needed. Implementation of recommended plans will be the responsibility of the AVP for Graduate and Undergraduate Programs.

Rationale: Wide ranging dialogue will be important so that all stakeholders have input into the process. The assessment facilitators have direct connections to college faculty that have been focused on assessment of department and university learning outcomes.

Approved: 11/16/15

Vote: 9-0-0

Present: Mathur, Shifflett, El-Miaari, Beyersdorf, Gleixner, Becker, Laker, Grosvenor, Curry

47 Absent: None
48 Financial Impact: None expected
49 Workload Impact: Additional workload for the Director of Assessment and members of
50 assessment facilitators engaged in campus-wide discussions and subsequent work to
51 develop recommendations for the assessment of core competencies.

San José State University
Academic Senate
Organization and Government Committee
November 30, 2015
First Reading

AS 1594

Policy Recommendation

Update of Policy on Selection and Review of Administrators

Legislative History: Rescinds F10-5 and S06-3. S06-3 superseded F98-2 related to the Selection and Review of Administrators to provide a rearrangement of responsibilities and a clearer definition of the scope of the policy in the context of a need for broader participation of staff and community representatives. F10-5 modified S06-3 to clarify the procedure for submitting faculty and staff nominations to serve on search and review committees.

Whereas: Combining past and current changes into one policy makes it easier to locate information pertaining to the selection and review of administrators, and

Whereas: A good case exists for including a Dean on decanal search committees; and

Whereas: Recent application of S06-3 has revealed a need for clarification in the composition section of the policy; therefore be it

Resolved: That F10-5 and S06-3 be rescinded and replaced with the updated policy presented below.

Rationale: The request for a review of S06-3 originated with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate as a result of its recent experiences applying the policy to determine the composition of decanal search committees. Particular difficulty was encountered with the section on the composition of search committees. In addition, discussions led to interest in having the policy updated to include a Dean on decanal searches.

Approved: 11/9/15

Vote: 9-0-0

Present: Grosvenor, Sibley, Laker, Beyersdorf, Muller, Curry, Gleixner, Shifflett, Becker

Absent: El-Miaari, Mathur

Financial Impact: None expected

Workload Impact: No change from current situation.

Selection and Review of Administrators

1. Academic Administrator and Vice President Searches and Appointments

1.1 Applicability

This policy applies to searches for and reviews of Management Personnel Plan (MPP) administrators who serve university-wide as vice presidents and those within the Academic Division including the Provost and all other associate vice president or equivalent positions such as Vice Provosts, and Associate Vice Presidents of Faculty Affairs, Graduate and Undergraduate Programs, International and Extended Studies, the college deans, and the Dean of the University Library. Where not otherwise specified, the words 'academic administrators' as used in this policy means all those listed in the Academic Division listed above.

1.2. Vacancies and Initiation of Procedures

As soon as practical after it is known that a vacancy has occurred or will occur in any of these positions, the President (for all vice presidents) or the Provost (for all other offices) shall cause a selection committee to be formed in accordance with these procedures.

1.3 Composition of Search Committees

Committees shall be large enough to allow for sufficiently broad representation, yet small enough so as not to be unwieldy. When feasible, an odd number of voting members will be appointed to eliminate the possibility of tied votes. Faculty, students, staff, and administrators shall be represented. Consideration should be given to breadth of representation, with respect to lower as well as upper faculty ranks, area of management responsibility, and with respect to gender and ethnicity. Regular (tenured and tenure-track) faculty shall comprise a majority on all search committees for administrators in the academic affairs division and at least one-third of other committees. If appropriate, alumni and community representatives may serve on search committees.

1.3.1 Special Procedures for Deans of Academic Colleges: The search committees for college deans shall be composed of ten members: three tenured faculty who are not department chairs, elected by and from the college faculty (but not more than one from any department); two department chairs from the college, elected by its department chairs; one staff member, elected by the staff of the college; one faculty member from another college, one student, one Dean (non voting), and one member of the community, each designated by the Provost.

Elections for the three faculty representatives from the college shall be arranged and conducted by ad hoc election committee comprised of all department chairs in that college. Each department in the college shall nominate one student from its majors, and

the Provost shall designate one student as a committee member from the departmental nominees. The community member should have experience or expertise relevant to one or more of the programs in the college.

1.3.2 Special Procedures for the Dean of the University Library. The search committee shall include three faculty librarians selected by and from the faculty librarians; two staff members, selected by the staff of the university library; two departments chairs from outside the library, one student, one Dean (non voting), and one member of the community, each designated by the Provost.

Recruitment of the two department chairs shall be arranged and conducted by the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate through normal committee on committees processes. Interested chairs will submit written statements reflecting their interest and qualifications.

1.3.3 Special Procedures for the Dean of International & Extended Studies (IES). The search committee shall include five faculty (inclusive of two department chairs); two IES staff members, selected by the staff of IES; one Dean (non-voting), one student, and one member of the community, each designated by the Provost.

Recruitment of the faculty shall be arranged and conducted by the Associate Vice Chair of the Senate through normal committee on committees processes. Interested faculty will submit written statements reflecting their interest and qualifications.

1.4 Recruitment and Selection of Committee Members

1.4.1 Recruitment. Except as provided in 1.3.1, 1.3.2, and 1.3.3 above, an open nomination process for potential members for search and review committees shall be used. The Academic Senate shall publish notice of intention to appoint a search committee and shall solicit written statements either in hard copy or electronically for membership on the committee from the University community. Nominations (including self nominations) must include a statement of interest and qualifications and include the nominee's signed or electronic consent to serve by the published nomination deadline.

1.4.2 Selection. Except as provided in 1.3.1, 1.3.2, and 1.3.3 above, committee members shall be selected from among those nominated by mutual consent of the President and the Senate Executive Committee. If the President and the Executive Committee cannot arrive at mutual agreement, the President (or Provost, if the search is not for a vice president) shall confer with the chair of the Senate to attempt to arrive at a mutually satisfactory course of action. Failing that, the President or Provost shall appoint the membership. The President or Provost shall select the committee chair from the committee membership.

1.5. Scope and Procedures

The President or Provost shall determine the scope and procedures of the search process in consultation with the committee. The scope and procedures of the search, the target date for the report, the funds and clerical assistance available, the minimum requirements for candidates, the qualifications of the expected finalists, and other matters relating to the selection process should be discussed. The scope of the search shall always be as wide as feasible under the circumstances and shall be conducted in accordance with the University's policies and procedures on equal opportunity and diversity. Likely candidates must be interviewed. Provisions should be made for the campus community to meet the candidates. The deliberations and recommendations of the committee shall be confidential.

1.6. Committee Recommendations

At the conclusion of its search, the committee shall report to the President or Provost, without ranking, the names of the best-qualified candidates. The President or Provost shall meet with the committee to discuss its recommendations. Members of the committee shall not take part in negotiations with a candidate unless requested to do so by the President or Provost. The search committee's records shall be turned over to the President or Provost with its report. Upon delivery of the committee's report to the President or Provost all committee records shall be destroyed.

1.7. Action by the President

The President or Provost may appoint any person recommended by the committee. If the President or Provost decides not to appoint, or is unable to appoint, any of the recommended candidates, the President or Provost may ask the committee to extend the search, or the President or Provost may consult with the Senate Executive Committee regarding appointment of a new selection committee for a new search, consistent with the provisions of this policy.

1.8. Interim Appointments

An interim appointment occurs when a position covered by this policy has or will be vacated and there is insufficient time or it is otherwise impractical to complete the normal search process explained above. The President or Provost, in consultation with the elected members of the Senate Executive Committee, may make interim appointments.

Alternatively, at the discretion of the President or Provost, the selection process for an interim appointee may utilize a selection committee wherein the interim position is announced campus-wide and interviews are held. While there is no requirement to announce the position off-campus, such announcement is not prohibited. The search committee must be no smaller than three people and will be selected by the President or Provost in consultation with the elected members of the Senate Executive Committee. Interim appointments usually are for a period of one year, unless a different period is specified at the time of the appointment. An interim appointment may be

renewed or extended by the President or Provost as needed in consultation with the elected members of the Senate Executive Committee.

1.9. Acting Appointments

The title “acting” (e.g., acting dean) shall be applied to an individual who is designated to act on behalf of an administrator covered by this policy, who is on a short-term absence (illness, vacation, etc.), on leave, or has left his/her position on extremely short notice. The President or designee in consultation with the elected members of the Senate Executive Committee may make an acting appointment. In an emergency, acting appointments may be made by the President or Provost (in consultation with the Chair of the Academic Senate if possible). Acting appointments usually are of short duration, lasting until either the incumbent returns or an interim appointment can be made according to the procedure described in this policy. In unusual circumstances, an acting appointment may be renewed or extended by the President or Provost in consultation with the elected members of the Senate Executive Committee.

2. Reviews of Administrators

2.1. Timing of Review.

If the incumbent wishes to continue in his or her position beyond the sixth year, a review of the incumbent shall be initiated according to the provisions of this policy in the second semester of the fifth year of an incumbent's term. The review shall be concluded by the beginning of the sixth year of the incumbent's term. The President may at any time initiate an interim review.

2.2. Appointment and Composition of Review Committee.

For all offices covered by this policy, a review committee shall be appointed and constituted in accordance with the procedures specified in Part 1, Sections 1.3 and 1.4 of this policy. The Provost shall not be eligible to serve on committees to review academic administrators.

2.3 Criteria for Review.

The review committee, in consultation with the President (for vice presidents) or the Provost (for all other offices), shall specify the criteria for evaluating the incumbent's job performance, based upon the incumbent's job description and the function of the particular administrative office. The incumbent shall be asked to examine the criteria developed and to make such comments or suggestions as may seem advisable.

2.4 Procedures for Review.

The review committee, in consultation with the President (for all Vice Presidents) or the Provost (for all other offices), shall develop procedures for conducting the review. The

procedures shall be designed to secure appropriate information and appraisals of performance from as many persons as may be feasible who are knowledgeable of the incumbent's performance. If he/she so desires, the incumbent shall be given an opportunity to provide the review committee with a self- evaluation based upon the criteria developed by the committee. The opinions and judgments received by review committees, the deliberations and reports of such committees, and any accompanying materials, shall be confidential.

2.5. Report of the Review Committee.

2.5.1 The review committee shall consult with the President (for all vice presidents) or the Provost (for all other offices) before drafting its report. Following that consultation, and at the conclusion of its evaluative activities, the review committee shall prepare a written report embodying findings and conclusions. The report of the review committee shall include a statement of strengths found and improvements desired in the incumbent's performance with respect to the evaluative criteria. All raw data collected for review shall accompany, but not be part of, the review committee's report.

2.5.2 The report shall normally contain a specific recommendation by the review committee that the incumbent be reappointed or not be reappointed, with or without qualification. A majority vote of the review committee shall be sufficient to approve the report; the numerical vote shall be stated in the report. A minority report or reports shall be appended if requested by any member of the committee. Minority reports shall be seen by all members of a review committee.

2.5.3 Before forwarding the report, the review committee shall:

- provide a draft copy of the proposed report to the incumbent
- provide the incumbent with an opportunity to meet with the review committee in order to discuss the report
- provide the incumbent with the opportunity to submit to the committee a written statement which shall become part of the report to the President

2.5.4 The President (for all vice presidents) or the Provost (for all other offices) shall again consult with the review committee to share his or her inclination and the reasons therefore.

2.6. Action of the President.

Ultimate responsibility for the retention of administrators belongs solely to the President. If, after discussion with the review committee, the incumbent, and other appropriate sources of information, the President is inclined to believe a decision other than that recommended by the committee would best serve the interests of the University, before acting on that inclination the President shall:

- Consult with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, at which time both the report of the review committee and the reasons why the President is inclined to a decision other than that recommended would be revealed to and shared with the

276 Executive Committee. The purpose of such a meeting would be to ascertain if some
277 mutually agreeable course of action or decision can be found upon which the
278 President could act. Failing that, the President shall
279 • Make such decision as he or she considers best for the welfare of the University.

1 **San José State University**
2 **Academic Senate**
3 **Curriculum and Research Committee**
4 **November 30, 2015**
5 **Final reading**
6

AS 1595

7 **Policy Recommendation: Amending F15-5**
8

9 **Rationale:** After F15-5 was signed by the president, it was discovered that there was
10 an existing policy, F73-8, that dealt with special examinations (i.e.,
11 challenge exams). This policy was not on the current chronological list of
12 university policies and not on the obsolete policies list. F73-8 provides
13 guidelines for three types of examinations: Advanced Placement (AP),
14 College Level Examination Program (CLEP), and Special Examination-
15 Specific Course Credit (defined on our campus as Challenge Exams).
16 F15-5 changed the guidelines for the Special Examination category to
17 align with current CSU policies.
18

19 **Resolved:** That "Amends F73-8" be added to the Legislative History of F15-5.
20
21

22 **Approved (C&R):** November 19, 2015

23 **Vote:** 12-0-0 (by electronic vote)

24 **Present:** Anagnos, Bacich, Backer, Buzanski, Clements, Heil, Mathur,
25 Matoush, Romero, Schultz-Krohn, Sibley, Stacks

26 **Absent (not voting):** Coopman

27 **Curricular Impact:** None

28 **Financial Impact:** None

29 **Workload Impact:** None

ACADEMIC COUNCIL POLICY RECOMMENDATION #F73-8

The Academic Council at its meeting of December 3, 1973, passed the following resolution as presented by June McCann, Chairman of the Curriculum Committee

ADVANCED STANDING BY EXAMINATION

Advanced standing by examination is designed to encourage a student to seek university credit in areas where he has competence, but for which he has not earned credit by the usual academic process. The procedure is designed to permit the student to accelerate progress toward the degree and to provide a wider selection of course work.

Advanced standing by examination is divided into two categories: (1) advanced placement by examination, and (2) advanced course credit by examination.

ADVANCED PLACEMENT BY EXAMINATION

1. Social Science. All students attending a California State University or College must satisfy specific subject requirements in Social Science. Students who feel they have adequate knowledge to pass a test in these fields may challenge the requirement by special examination. The examinations which cover the three Social Science subject requirements of U.S. Government, California Government and U.S. History, are given free during Orientation and Registration Week (see the Testing Office, Adm. 21 for dates), and for a fee of \$2.00 during the remainder of the semester. A student with satisfactory scores on one or more of these tests will be excused from the appropriate requirement. When the examinations are taken during Orientation and Registration Week, test scores will be made available to the student prior to registration. Students excused from one or more specific subject requirements through these examinations may substitute eight-to-nine units of other courses in social sciences to satisfy the unit requirements in this area.
2. Foreign Language. Placement examinations are given during Orientation and Registration Week in French, German and Spanish to all students wishing to continue in a language which they have already studied beyond level two in high school, but which they have not studied in the university (see the Schedule of Classes for dates). The examination will determine the level at which they will be permitted to enroll for credit.

Students having studied the language in college (at San Jose State University or elsewhere) will not take the placement examinations, but will enroll in the course for which they qualify on the basis of units accumulated.

Placement examinations in Italian, Japanese, Latin and Russian are given during Orientation and Registration Week by arrangement. Students wishing placement examinations in these languages should contact the Foreign Languages Department.

3. Chemistry. All students wishing registration in Chemistry 1A, 4A, 10 or 11 A, are required to take a placement examination in Chemistry which is given during Orientation and Registration Week (see the Schedule of Classes for dates and other details).

ADVANCED COURSE CREDIT BY EXAMINATION FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

1. College Level Examination Program (CLEP) - General Credit. The college level examination program (CLEP) is designed to be a means through which recognition, academic credit and advanced placement may be given for less conventional forms of educational experiences. Those who may have reached a university level of education in certain areas through home or correspondence study, on-the-job training, television courses, or other means, may take the CLEP examination and receive credit toward graduation. Students who have received conventional university credit for courses taken in the areas covered by the examination are not eligible to receive credit through the CLEP examination.

Students who complete the General Examination of CLEP with a score of 500 or better will receive 30 units of advanced credit as follows:

Social Science	6 units in General Education
Humanities	6 units in General Education
Natural Science	6 units in General Education
Elective Credit	6 units in General Education
Elective Credit	6 units in the University

Specific details of the program may be obtained from the Testing Office.

2. College Entrance Examination Board Advanced Placement Program (CEEB) - General Credit. California State University, San Jose grants credit toward its undergraduate degrees for successful completion of examination of the Advanced Placement Program of the College Entrance Examination Board. Students who present scores of three or better will be granted six semester units of university credit.
3. Special Examination - Specific Course Credit. Credit by examination is designed to encourage a regularly enrolled student to seek university credit in courses in which the person appears to be reasonably well qualified by training or experience, but for which he has not earned credit by the usual academic processes. Courses for which credit by special examination may be earned are determined by the department, from those listed in the current university catalogue. Course credit by examination will not be allowed in a course in which the student has received a failing grade in the same course previously attempted, or in which he has unsuccessfully sought credit by examination. Course credit by examination may be granted as follows:

- (a) The student will enroll in the course and indicate "credit by examination" in the regular registration procedure. Units of credit by examination are counted as part of the total unit load for which the student is registered in a given semester. Application for credit by examination shall be completed by the student and approved before the end of registration by the department and instructor offering the course, and by the Testing Office.
- (b) The examination must be administered not later than the third week of instruction. The student must be notified of his success or failure by the end of the third week of instruction. If the student is successful, the grade "CR" will be reported to the Registrar at the end of the semester with the regular grade report for the class. If the student fails the examination, he may elect to continue the course for credit, or he may drop the course through the regular drop procedure.
- (c) Requests for exceptions to these provisions and procedures shall be made by petition. The petition shall explain fully why the case is unusual and the nature of the inconvenience. The petition, obtained from the appropriate school dean, shall be granted when approved by the instructor, the department chairman and the school dean. Such approval shall be reported to the Testing Office.

ACTION BY UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT:

RECEIVED
DEC 05 1973
President:
San Jose State University

Approved
John H. Grunzel
12-28-73

Copies to:

AVP
EVP
All Deans