2018/2019 Academic Senate

MINUTES
September 17, 2018

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

Ex Officio:
    Present: Frazier, Van Selst, Manzo,
        Lee, J., Rodan

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

Deans:
    Present: Ehrman, Stacks, Elliott,
        Olin
    Absent: None

Students:
    Present: Fernandez-Rios, Gallo, Gill,
        Pang, Rodriguez
    Absent: Kethepalli

Alumni Representative:
    Present: Walters

Emeritus Representative:
    Present: Buzanski

Honorary Representative:
    Present: Lessow-Hurley

General Unit Representatives:
    Present: Higgins, Matoush,
        Monday, Trousdale
    Absent: Hurtado

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

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

EDUC Representatives:
    Present: Marachi, Mathur
    Absent: None

ENGR Representatives:
    Present: Ramasubramanian, Kumar, Sullivan-Green
    Absent: None

H&A Representatives:
    Present: Khan, Riley, McKee, Mok, Ormsbee
    Absent: None

SCI Representatives:
    Present: Cargill, French, Kim
    Absent: White

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

II. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–
The minutes of May 14, 2018 (Last meeting of 2017-2018) were approved.
The minutes of May 14, 2018 (First meeting of 2018-2019) were approved.

III. Communications and Questions –
A. From the Chair of the Senate –
Chair Frazier made a few comments on the passing of Dr. Amy Strage regarding how committed and dedicated Dr. Strage had been to the University and the Academic Senate; the Academic Senate and Emeritus Faculty Association expressed condolences. More information will be available on services for Dr. Strage in the near future.

Chair Frazier welcomed new senators; Interim Provost Joan Ficke and VP Patrick Day.

The Athletics Division will be scheduling a presentation sometime this semester to the Academic Senate on the topic of concussions.

B. **From the President of the University** –
President Papazian expressed condolences to Dr. Army Strage's family on her recent passing. This reminds all of us how precious life is.

President Papazian commented that the university is completely committed to the faculty with regard to the Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA) movement and the university is in it for the long haul. This was a long time in coming and the President thanked Interim Provost Ficke for putting it into action. It is up to the faculty now to embrace it and produce the kind of work she knows they are capable of.

The President's Office will be putting out a call for a new Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) in accordance with university policy and will be working with the Senate Chair and the Athletics Board. The current FAR has received a grant for research that will not allow him to complete his term.

The Provost Search Committee has met and finalized the position description. We are now in serious recruiting mode. The President hopes to bring finalists to campus right after Thanksgiving. The President thanked Interim Provost Ficke for her assistance and said she was already making a positive impact.

The President will be moving ahead with the creation of the VP of Innovation and Research position. She has discussed it with the administration and feels the time is right.

The Board of Trustees approved the design for the new Science building. They were a little shocked to learn the university had not had a new academic building in 30 years. The President reminded them outside the meeting that we hope not to wait another 30 years for another building. There will be eight floors. Each floor will have laboratories and space for teaching.

The President hopes to wrap up work on the goals and objectives of the Strategic Plan this Fall.

We had a respectable budget this year, but the process is already beginning for next year. The trustees are very interested in developing a three-year budget so we have some ability to plan. They would also like to move toward a different funding model so that there is a sustainable source of funding that is separate from the discretionary budget the Governor decides to give us each year.

Questions:
C: Thank you on behalf of the Academic Senate for the RSCA plan that you and your administration have produced. Research has been unfunded for faculty at SJSU for 40 years.

IV.   **Executive Committee Report:**

    A. **Minutes of the Executive Committee:**
      Executive Committee Minutes of May 7, 2018 –
      Executive Committee Minutes of May 21, 2018 –
      Executive Committee Minutes of June 14, 2018 –
      Executive Committee Minutes of July 17, 2018 –
      Questions:
      Q: What is a power lounge and what does it mean to be SJSU branded?
      A: At the San José Mineta Airport, Gate 18, there is a lounge in terminal A and a lounge in terminal B that have lots of outlets. The airport calls them power lounges. The one in Terminal B has images of alums and faculty members from San José State University such as Yosh Uchida.
      Executive Committee Minutes of August 16, 2018 –
      Executive Committee Minutes of August 27, 2018 –

      Consent Calendar:
    The consent calendar of September 17, 2018 is approved.

    B. **Executive Committee Action Items:**
    Chair Frazier presented *AS 1704, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Information to the campus community for serving and assisting undocumented Spartans (First Reading).* Senator Shifflett presented a motion to suspend the rules and make AS 1704 a final reading. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the motion passed with No Nays and 1 Abstention. [Senator Manzo suggested that prior to hanging the the sign provided, faculty and staff attend the training at the UndocuSpartan Student Resource Center so they know what to tell students. Senator Mok suggested that UCCD ask one department member to take training and then train all their faculty. Chair Frazier will ensure the resolution is distributed widely.] **The Senate voted and AS 1704 was approved unanimously as presented with No Nays or Abstentions.**

    Chair Frazier presented a motion to switch the October 1 and October 15 Senate meetings. The motion was seconded. VP Faas has requested additional time to prepare the budget presentation and is requesting the budget presentations be held at the October 15 Senate meeting. **The Senate voted and the motion passed with No Nays or Abstentions**.

V.   **Unfinished Business:**

VI. Policy Committee and University Library Board Action items (In rotation):

A. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):
Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1707, Senate Management Resolution, Rescind Outdated Resolutions: SM-F82-3, SM-S84-4, SM-S87-3, SM-F88-2, SM-S89-3, SM-S90-3 (Final Reading).* Senator Shifflett presented a friendly amendment to remove "SM-S89-3" from the title and line 24, as well as to strike all language pertaining to SM-S89-3 in lines 37-40. **<u>The Senate voted and AS 1707 passed as amended with No Nays or Abstentions</u>**.

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1669, Policy Recommendation, Amendment to Senate Constitution: Regarding Administrative Representatives (First Reading)*.

Question:
Q: Can you provide the Senate an example of an AVP from outside Academic Affairs?
A: In Academic Affairs the AVPs include the AVP for GUP, the AVP for Faculty and Student Success, the AVP Research, and the AVP for Academic Budgets and Planning. Outside of Academic Affairs there are 11 AVPs.
C: Maybe a list of both would be beneficial prior to debate.
A: I will share that with the committee.

Q: You took out the language about the staggered two-year terms, is there a reason?
A: We worked really hard to separate membership and process in the constitution and bylaws. The term would be changed in the bylaws.

Q: Did the Executive Committee discuss reevaluating where the Senate feels it wants to put its priority, because it has been mentioned that it is not a faculty Senate but an Academic Senate and we know there are a lot of functional areas in other divisions. One of the challenges would be determining who among the 11 outside of Academic Affairs would be the best person to have on the Senate. I got the sense from our previous discussion that this may depend on what issues are coming before the Senate, so where do we want to put our strengths?
A: We have had all those discussions and more. O&G did talk about needing at the leadership level representation on the Senate, which is our President and VPs. However, we also discussed needing leadership at the level of where it gets done and that would be the AVPs. The actual selection of the AVP outside of Academic Affairs would be made by the President in consultation with the Executive Committee.

Q: Did the committee consider having someone from University Advancement that has outreach to donors?
A: There are four AVPs in University Advancement that would be in the mix of the 11 AVPs outside of Academic Affairs for consideration. The VP of University

Advancement used to sit on the Senate, but the Executive Committee and the Senate agreed that the VP of University was needed elsewhere rather than stuck in Senate meetings. The seat was then removed from the Senate and replaced with the Chief Diversity Officer.

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1656, Modification to Bylaw 1.10 Pertaining to Administrative Representatives on the Senate (First Reading).*

Questions*:*
Q: I'm not understanding the need to identify who is an AVP outside of Academic Affairs and who reports to the Provost. What is the objective?
A: What we are trying to do is clean-up language. In the bylaw right now, it speaks to Academic Deans reporting directly to the Provost.
Q: They are all within the division, so there are a lot of language issues. If you are looking for Academic Affairs Leadership Team that would include a range of folks that might or might not report directly to the Provost.
A: I agree. We have cleaned-up the language and removed "Academic Deans" and in its place added an "AVP within Academic Affairs." This takes away vague language that was there that really didn't have a meaning on campus and puts in its place the concrete language, "AVP within Academic Affairs."

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1708, Policy Recommendation, Charge and Membership of the Institutional Review Board (First Reading).*

Questions:
Q: On page 3, line 100, can you explain the differences in the number of faculty from the various colleges?
A: My understanding is that the volume of IRB proposals necessitates additional representation from Education, Health and Human Sciences, and Social Science.
C: Yes, the increase in faculty was in response to a task force report evaluating workload issues and was specifically to get certain disciplines and have the expertise available since they were having an overwhelming number of protocols from those disciplines. However, it has turned out that the number of protocols per year remains high, around 400 per year. It is interesting that we have a single IRB Coordinator, where other campuses have two or three. Our coordinator is extremely capable and we have a responsive IRB. Thus, we have been able to keep up with the demands. There is one other thing on the horizon. The federal government has notified us they are changing some of the rules. We should see a decrease in the number of protocols going out, because they will only need to be registered and not evaluated. In the future, we may have a diminished need for some of the membership, but we are not there yet.

Q: Even with the federal changes it seems to me that if we change our standards we could have the potential for compromising some of the protocols going out?
A: The way the process is happening currently is that there is a decision tree that the PI makes you use and if there is any doubt then it comes to the coordinator. If the

coordinator signs off on it then the institutional officer (the AVP) looks at it as well, so there are always two people overseeing it.

Q: I'm questioning not having the Associate Dean for Research be on the IRB, especially when the AVP must sign off on it?

A: The AVP has always reviewed and signed off after the IRB process.

Q: So there is no additional value to having the AVP on the committee?

A: No.

Q: Why are you switching the Associate Dean with the IRB Coordinator?

A: It is a matter of why duplicate when you only need one or the other. The Office of Research is already represented by the IRB Coordinator, so the Associate Dean being there is not needed. This is coming from the IRB.

C: We were not in this position say 10 years ago, but we've invested considerable amount of professional development for the IRB Coordinator. The IRB Coordinator is an Analyst III position, which is a high level Analyst position that has a ton of certifications to do with data privacy, ethics, etc. Every year the coordinator attends additional training to ensure she stays up-to-date. In the past, if we had someone that was just going through the mechanical administrative kind of work, we would not have moved to have this position become a voting member which we did several years back.

C: This reminds me that we are lucky to have a capable person in the coordinator spot now, but what if that person leaves? Maybe we'd be better off having an appointee from the Office of Research as a member of the IRB.

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1709, Senate Management Resolution, Modification to the Membership of the Professional Standards Committee (Final Reading). Senator Stacks presented a friendly amendment to add the Student Senator seat that was accidentally dropped from the resolution*. **The Senate voted and AS 1709 was approved as amended with 1 Nay and No Abstentions.**

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

C. **Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):**
Senator Schultz-Krohn presented *AS 1705, Policy Recommendation: Rescind S02-6: Metropolitan University Scholars Experience (MUSE) New Student Seminar Program in Core General Education (First Reading).* Senator Schultz-Krohn presented a friendly amendment to correct the vote to "9-0-1." Senator Shifflett presented a motion to suspend the rules and make AS 1705 a final reading. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the Shifflett motion passed. **The Senate voted and AS 1705 passed as amended with No Nays or Abstentions.**

Senator *Schultz-Krohn presented AS 1706, Policy Recommendation, Rescind S73-10, Admission of Disqualified Students to Extension Courses (First Reading).* Senator Mathur presented a motion to move the resolution to a Final Reading. The motion was seconded by Senator Shifflett. The Senate voted and the Mathur motion

passed with 4 Nays and 0 Abstentions. **The Senate voted and AS 1706 passed with 4 Nays and 3 Abstentions**.

D. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA): No report.

E. Professional Standards Committee (PS):
Senator Peter presented *AS 1711, Policy Recommendation, Principles Regarding Privacy of Electronic Information: Rescinds and replaces F97-7 (First Reading).*
Some of the language in the broad principles came from the AAUP document. We believe the statement of principles is stronger than the old 1997 policy. This policy recommendation will be implemented through a Presidential Directive. This gives the President the authority to figure out the best way to put it into practice.

 Questions:
Q: When this comes back can we switch the order so that we approve the new policy prior to rescinding the old policy?
A: This policy rescinds the old policy simultaneously with passing the new policy. However, it is important that we reach a final action on the policy recommendation before we reach a conclusion on the Sense of the Senate Resolution on the same subject, because the Sense of the Senate Resolution refers to the new policy.

Q: When I do research I cannot make contracts on behalf of the university, so I rely on the contract the university has with me, which is that they will maintain the privacy of all the records I have. In the past, when colleagues have faced situations of intrusion, attempts to get research records, etc. the university has stood by them. This document doesn't look like something that would protect me. If I go forward with research on people that could be harmed can I tell the IRB that I have things in place that will protect the subject?
A: You mean with regard to this particular policy recommendation?
Q: Yes.
A: Well, this is more than what we have right now.
Q: If I say someone is going to be protected, I think I'm overstepping my bounds.
A: There are other protections in the ethics and misconduct policies. The university may choose to defend the integrity of your research whether there is policy or not. The 1997 policy is vaguer and less protective than this one, and that is what we've been operating under for 21 years.

Q: We were all recently sent information on cybersecurity protection being mandated by the Chancellor's Office. Looking at 1.5 and storage, what would that fall under that?
A: When this first came up I started googling and found some detailed info at other campuses. PS is interested in learning more about this before bringing a final document.

Q: Would you ask the committee if there is room in the policy to add a paragraph

that speaks to minimum intrusion?

A: Yes. There was language in the original replacement policy the Senate passed, but that was not acceptable to the President. However, we are urging that that language appear in the Presidential Directive.

Q: At some point can someone explain to us how information is stored and passed around?

A: I'd recommend the Senate invite the Information Security Officer to come and speak to the Senate. The Information Security Officer spoke to the PS Committee twice.

Q: Would there be a possibility to add another principle for algorithmic transparency and accountability?

A: Email me the language and PS will review it. We'd prefer to put most of the changes in the Sense of the Senate Resolution. We are trying to adhere to what the President wants in the policy as this policy has been three years in the making. I'm not sure if the President would approve another principle or not.

Senator Peter presented *AS 1710, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Advocating Additional Protection for the Privacy of Electronic Information at SJSU (First Reading).*
This resolution accompanies the policy recommendation we discussed earlier. The PS Committee adhered to the direction of the President when preparing the policy recommendation. However, the PS Committee maintains that the privacy protections presented in the previous policy the President vetoed are essential and this Sense of the Senate Resolution urges the President to include them in a Presidential Directive. There were also numerous accompanying documents included in an attachment that were sent to the Senate. The PS Committee believes the privacy protections that were deleted from the original policy recommendation are consistent with commonly accepted standards for the protection of privacy at a university and the committee is concerned, for example, that without the incorporation of those protections in some manner, our faculty, staff, and students will have a lower level of privacy protection than that recommended by the UC and the AAUP. In the President's message, a great deal was made of the CSU Responsible Use Policy. The Responsible Use Policy covers many things besides privacy. There are several brief mentions about privacy in the Responsible Use Policy, but they are very vague. The PS Committee urges faculty to read both the Policy Recommendation and the Sense of the Senate Resolution carefully so that you understand what we are dealing with today. The final resolved clause urges that these concerns be allayed by the incorporation of some of these privacy protections into the Presidential Directive. The PS Committee outlines five of these in particular, so you understand how others have done this and what we will lack if this language is not incorporated into a Presidential Directive. The Responsible Use Policy for the CSU specifically makes provisions for campus policies to supplement it. If the policy recommendation is adopted, it calls for a Presidential Directive.

Questions:

C: Thank you so much for this. It is so timely. There was an FBI publication last week raising alarm on education technology and student data privacy. I just wanted to add that I'm not sure where that statement of algorithmic transparency would be more appropriate, either in the Policy Recommendation or the Sense of the Senate Resolution. I'll send you information. There are a number of key important updates. Also, can there be something about communication with the campus community routinely about information privacy and updates like that FBI announcement, etc.

Q: Thanks for the footnotes. They help put everything in context. When I step back and think about privacy protection, I don't see any distinction between the UC and CSU. I don't see why something might be needed in the CSU that isn't needed elsewhere. Am I missing something?
A: No.

Q: Could you give us a brief rundown on other campus policies and possibly add one more footnote?
A: We been a leader on this since 1997. I think we had the first privacy policy in the CSU. It is a good question. Most of the other campuses do rely heavily on the CSU's Responsible Use Policy and I believe the provision in the CSU Responsible Use Policy that says campuses can have their own policy is because of our 1997 policy. PS will do some research to see what the other campuses have.

VII.   State of the University Reports:

    A. Provost:

        Those of you that saw the memo the Interim Provost sent out on September 4, 2018 regarding Research Scholarship and Creative Activity (RSCA) know that it is a three-year process. The Office of the Provost has worked very hard on this. There are two prongs. The first is a disciplinary prong. All of the deans and their faculty have worked on metrics that they think are sensitive to the needs of the disciplines of their colleges, so one is not the same as the other. The other prong is a university expectation that this will be real scholarship. We are looking at something that connects directly with their teaching excellence. It is not about just one less course. Interim Provost Ficke thanked AVP Stacks, Marc D'Alarcao, and Deputy Provost Carl Kemnitz for their hard work on RSCA.

        We will be having a site visit in early October or November 2018 to evaluate our graduate programs. As the President is fond of saying, "We have more graduate students than Stanford has Undergraduate students." This is followed by a visit in November 2018 by Shawn Gallagher who will be looking at the post-baccalaureate eco system.

    B. AS President:

        AS had their audit approved.

Senator Chelby Gill is leading a team working on a restructure of AS Student Government this year. Part of that structure will be an Academic Affairs Council that will have students from each college.

AS approved a $30,000 donation for the Economic Crisis Response Team.

The AS Annual Report will be out soon.
There was a recent graduate student mixer hosted by AS and the students expressed a lot of interest in working with faculty on their research projects. Please reach out to them they are eager to help.

C. Vice President for Administration and Finance:
VP Faas could not be here today, but he sent a message. Faculty and staff can enjoy all you can eat in the commons on Fridays for $6.

D. Vice President for Student Affairs:
The VPSA is going to be spending a lot of time thinking about and working on the safety of the residential quad on campus.

The VPSA will also be looking at and working on the student conduct process and evaluating job descriptions and any structural issues.

The last thing the VPSA will be looking at is enrollment. Census is just a few days away and we are looking at 35,172. It is a strong enrollment, but it is a dip from last year and not necessarily a small dip. It is nothing to be worried about, but it is about a 500 student dip. We are up in some of our student population such as transfer students. However, we are down in other areas such as International students and we need to know exactly where those numbers are moving so we can catch and make changes.

[Senator Shifflett presented a motion to extend the meeting by 5 minutes. The motion was seconded by Senator Buzanski. The Senate voted and the Shifflett motion passed.]

E. Chief Diversity Officer (CDO):
The CDO is continuing the Faculty Diversity search committee training that she began last semester. Using funds from the faculty diversity grant the CDO received, she is sending several faculty members to conferences. The CDO is also working on developing exit interviews for faculty.

The Title IX Coordinator will start on October 22, 2018. The CDO will now be looking for a Diversity Trainer.

There were 101 campus members that signed up for the Intergroup Dialogue Training that spans 4 ½ days.

F. CSU Faculty Trustee (by special invitation): Report distributed electronically.
This is Constitution Day. Trustee Sabalius sent out his preliminary report to the Senate listserv. The report doesn't include the recent financial deliberations. Trustee Sabalius will have more to report on that at the next Senate meeting. The Board of Trustees approved the Interdisciplinary Science Building design. Trustee Sabalius will have three reports to talk more about at the next meeting and they include the Graduation Initiative, International Education, and RSCA.

G. CSU Statewide Senators:
The ASCSU has been discussing GE changes from the Chancellor and Shared Governance and Processes in the CSU. Senator Lee will forward additional information to Senators.

VIII.   Special Committee Reports:
A.   Annual Report on Recruitment, Hiring, and Retention of a Diverse Faculty by Interim Provost Joan Ficke, Time Certain: 3:00 p.m.
A handout was distributed to all Senators. There have been 65 newly hired tenure track faculty hired for this Fall and equally as many lines approved for next year. Surprisingly, while 56% are white, 24% are Asian, 7% are Hispanic/Latino, 3% are Black, .4% are American Indian, and 10% are in the Other category. Although this doesn't match the undergraduate student population, it is something SJSU should be very proud of being in the heart of Silicon Valley. While there is still a way to go, SJSU has come a great distance. The ratio between lecturers and tenure-track faculty has shifted considerably on other campuses, but not so much here. SJSU has been able to establish some consistency with regard to the number of lecturers (see handout for details).

Questions:
Q: Can you speak to the reason for the departures? We seem to be doing a good job recruiting, but aren't so successful keeping our faculty.
A: It is difficult to live in this area and keep qualified people due to the cost of living in the area. People are not leaving because they are unhappy with SJSU. They are probably having some issues living in this geographical region. However, we are recalibrating the opportunity for tenure-track faculty to have the kind of professional life offered in other places. I suspect this will change things in the future. Interim Provost Ficke thinks within two years you will see a real difference.

Q: Why is the ratio of lecturers much higher in the college of Humanities and the Arts?
A: I don't know for sure, but particularly with artists, you are getting people that aren't from the academy that participate in non-traditional academic departments.

Q: I'm curious if anyone is tracking how the ratio of men to women plays out across disciplines?
A: We do this across colleges, but that can be a suggestion.

Q: Is there any way we can do exit interviews or surveys to see why faculty are leaving? I know personally over the last ten years that four of our faculty left within the first two years of arrival.
A: I've done that in the past and I'm open to suggestions. Places I have worked have had either the department chairs handle it, someone from Human Resources, or someone in the Office of the Provost. One of the Interim Provost's goals is to formalize the language used when "onboarding" new faculty. In places the Interim Provost has worked, faculty were compelled to come to orientation and were assigned a senior faculty member as a mentor.

Q: I'm curious, there are a number of long-term lecturers here that have terminal degrees and might like the opportunity to convert to tenure-tenure-track faculty. Is this something you would support?
A: My feelings about it is that I'd have to look at what the contract does or doesn't prohibit. In some places if you aren't hired for a tenure/tenure-track line you can't be in a tenure-track line. Can they be in a pool as an applicant for a position? I'd have to look at what the procedure is for that to occur. Assuming there are no barriers, there is no reason in the world a lecturer couldn't compete in a pool for a tenure-track position.

C: The CDO is hoping to use some funding from the University Diversity Grant and add some additional demographic variables other than ethnicity and gender to report on. Right now we use what is required by the national system.

Q: Those of us that do research struggle to find places to do it in. We need spaces that pull people in.
A: The Interim Provost is familiar with these concerns. The new Interdisciplinary Science Building will have both classrooms and laboratories on every floor.

C: I recommend reading the Sense of the Senate Resolution, SS-S14-1, which is the Report on Tenure Density from 2013. At that time, we were 10 or 11 points lower than other campuses in tenure density. We then flatlined at 53%.
A: This is a pattern on many campuses. You will go down when there is a budget crisis, and it takes time to recover.

B. Annual Report from the University Library Board (ULB), Time Certain: 3:30 p.m.
Chair Nick Taylor sent out the annual report by email so that Senators had a chance to read it prior to the meeting and could go right into questions. The ULB spent most of last year talking about open access publishing. The ULB was reminded that there was an Open Access Taskforce convened in 2009 to study this issue. Part of the report issued by the taskforce in 2010, was a recommendation that the ULB report back on our progress on the five resolutions that the taskforce report contained. One resolution was a Sense of the Senate Resolution that was almost word-for-word what we were proposing last Spring. That was passed in April of 2010. The second

recommendation involved student thesis. It was recommended that the policy on student thesis be reviewed so that student theses could be published on the institutional repository which is now SJSU Scholarworks. Emily Chan, the Interim Associate Dean for Research and Scholarship for the library runs Scholarworks and is here today to answer any questions about it. Those of you that have been here since 2014 know that the master's thesis and doctoral dissertation policy was revamped and republished as S14-10. The third recommendation was encouraging faculty to disseminate their published research on the institutional repository, SJSU Scholarworks. The library has done quite a bit of work on that including periodic emails that go out to faculty reminding them about Scholarworks, or introducing them to Scholarworks, and encouraging them to contact Emily with any questions or concerns. The library also participates in faculty orientation. The fourth recommendation was regarding residual rights. The university does not have an official policy requiring faculty to retain their residual rights, but in most cases it is possible for faculty to publish pre or post-print versions of their research in their institutional repository in addition to publishing in any proprietary journals that they choose. The ULB plans on sending out a faculty newsletter called "Smart Notes" on that topic this year. The fifth and final resolution was to modify RTP guidelines to treat open access publications on par with other publications. The RTP guidelines were not modified. The ULB was told this was not appropriate for a university-level policy and that it should be handled at the college and departmental level. Our plan for extending our education on this issue to departments is to work with the Professional Standards Committee on model language that can be given to departments that they can incorporate into their departmental RTP standards. I know that the English Department has incorporated some language like this in their standards. Finally, the ULB added a note about predatory journals. That is journals that pose as open access and then try to extract fees from faculty members who are hoping to publish. This is especially true with junior faculty members and with faculty members in other institutions around the world. The ULB is going to send out a newsletter about this as well.

Questions:
Q: The Political Science Department's RTP Guidelines were published and they contain language about open access if anyone wants to review them.
A: I congratulate you on that.

Q: Can you explain more about the resources available to help with predatory journals?
A: When faculty receive unsolicited emails relating to open access, I would suggest they check that title against the library's list of approved journals. The smart notes are newsletters that ULB has published throughout the semester.
C: I would suggest that the list be distributed to the departments for further distribution to the faculty.

Q: You mentioned that you are encouraging faculty to negotiate residual publishing rights, so that if they have a publication out there they are able to publish on

Scholarworks is that correct? So, in likewise fashion would a master's thesis be on Scholarworks? I have run into this whereby our students are trying to publish sections or part of it and it is coming up through their plagiarism mechanism. What do we do about this, or is this addressed in this particular opposition statement?
A: That's not addressed in this particular opposition statement, but with the recent Senate approval of S14-10 there is an embargo that can be placed on student work for up to five years. If a student wishes to publish part of their master's thesis they can suppress that for up to five years. Additionally, some publishers do not consider putting your work in an institutional repository as publishing. Depending on the journal publisher, they see master's level work or a doctoral dissertation as a very different thing than a journal article. It depends on the discipline and the publisher.

IX.   New Business: None

X.   Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m.