2015/2016 Academic Senate

MINUTES
April 25, 2016

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

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

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

Deans:
  Present: Green, Jacobs, Stacks, Hsu

Students:
  Present: Abukhdeir, Medrano, Romero, Gay Sandoval-Rios
  Absent: Sarris, Sandoval-Rios

Alumni Representative:
  Present: Walters

Emeritus Representative:
  Present: Buzanski

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

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

COB Representatives:
  Present: Virick, Sibley, Campsey

EDUC Representatives:
  Present: Mathur, Laker

ENGR Representatives:
  Present: Hamedi-Hagh, Sullivan-Green, Backer

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

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

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

II.   **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes–**
The minutes of April 4, 2016 were approved as amended (40-0-2).

III.   **Communications and Questions –**
     A. From the Chair of the Senate:
        Chair Kimbarow told the Senate that the Vice Presidents were meeting with a candidate for the Vice President of Administration and Finance position and would be arriving at 3 p.m. and will give their reports at the end of the meeting.

        Chair Kimbarow reminded Senators of the reception at the President's house on Sunday, May 1, 2016. This is the first Spring reception for the Senate at the President's house.

        The agenda is extremely full today, please keep your comments to a minimum.

B. From the President of the University –
Interim President Martin is working closely with incoming President Papazian.

IV.   **Executive Committee Report –**
       A. Executive Committee Minutes –
          Executive Committee Minutes of March 21, 2016 – No questions.
          Executive Committee Minutes of April 11, 2016 – No questions.

        B. Consent Calendar – The Senate approved the consent calendar of April 25, 2016 as
           written.

        C. Executive Committee Action Items:
           Chair Kimbarow presented *AS 1613, Senate Management Resolution, Conferring the*
           Title of Honorary Senator on Dr. Judith Lessow-Hurley (Final Reading). **The Senate**
           voted and AS 1613 passed as written (41-0-1).
           _____

           Chair Kimbarow presented *AS 1615, Sense of the Senate Resolution, Support of the You*
           Can Play Project (Final Reading).

           Senator Sabalius presented an amendment that was seconded to amend the second Resolved
           clause to read, "That the Division of Athletics at San José State University allocate funds to
           promote the...." The Senate voted and the Sabalius amendment failed (5-34-0).

           Senator Kaufman presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to strike
           "allocate funds to" from the first line of the 2nd Resolved clause.

           The Senate voted and AS 1615 passed as amended (34-0-0).

V.   **Unfinished Business -** None

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

        A. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R) –
           Senator Mathur presented *AS 1583, Policy Recommendation: Internships, Service*
           Learning, and Off-Campus Learning Experiences (Final Reading).

           Senator Heiden presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to add the words,
           "under the leadership of GUP" after "That the campus" in the 6th Resolved clause.

           Senator Mathur presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to add "; and" at the
           end of the first Whereas clause.

           Senator Frazier presented and amendment that was friendly to the body to replace "more

facile" with "simpler" before "process" in the 6th Resolved clause on the 2nd line.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was seconded to add to line 39, "by the SJSU contracts and purchasing office" after "template be created" in the first line of the 1st Resolved clause. The Senate voted and the Shifflett amendment failed (1-32-0).

The Senate voted and AS 1583 passed as amended (33-0-0).

Senator Mathur presented *AS 1607, Policy Recommendation, Restoring Options for Students with Quantitative Reasoning Disabilities Affecting Math Skills (Final Reading)*.

The Senate voted and AS 1607 passed as written (30-0-1).

Senator Mathur presented *AS 1609, Policy Recommendation, Amendment to F13-2, Technology Intensive, Hybrid and Online Courses and Programs (Final Reading).*

The Senate voted and AS 1609 passed as written (29-0-0).

Senator Mathur presented *AS 1622, Policy Recommendation, Academic Certificate Programs: Review and Approval Process (First Reading).*

Questions:

Q: What was the second to the last item you noted was changed?
A: The proposal content is clarified for the departments.

Q: Is it possible to substitute the requirements for "other certificates" using academic coursework?
A: I don't think so. The "other certificates" are non-credit.
Q: Right. If a non-credit certificate is in word processing or something, and I have an academic credit-bearing course that gives me that skill, where does that fall in this policy?
A: The policy doesn't speak to this. This policy is laying out the guidelines for academic certificate programs.

B. **Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA) –**
Senator Kaufman presented *AS 1608, Policy Recommendation, Student Rights and Responsibilities (Final Reading).*

Senator Kaufman presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to remove everything from line 91 through line 103.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to line 77 to add, "and maintain a webpage with

links to each item." after "Responsibilities." The amendment was seconded. Senator Shifflett withdrew her amendment.

Senator Van Selst presented an amendment to line 75 to replace "all" with "exemplar." The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Van Selst amendment failed (7-26-0).

Senator Laker presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to replace "all" with "relevant."

The Senate voted and AS 1608 passed as amended (33-1-0).

Senator Kaufman presented *AS 1620, Policy Recommendation, Probation and Disqualification (First Reading)*.

Questions:

Q: Is there was anything in the policy that is different than what our current practice is?
A: Not that I'm aware of.

Q: Can we get a copy with the changes highlighted for the final reading?
A: Yes, absolutely we can do that.

Q: Is there anything you know about that will change, especially relating to graduate students?
A: Yes, one thing. Previously there was a rule on the books that if a graduate student finished their degree program entirely with a GPA under 3.0, there were a set of rules they had to follow to finish. The rules were quite draconian. They had to take two classes and they had to be graduate level and taken in the same semester. If at the end of those two classes they had not raised their GPA to 3.0, they would be permanently disqualified. This policy doesn't give them a full green light to take as many classes are they want to raise their GPA, but they can take 9 units. They can take two at a time or three classes at a time to raise their GPA. You can't do grade forgiveness as a graduate student, so it is either grade averaging or new courses.

Q: On line 342 where it describes the five categories by which a graduate student can petition for reinstatement, is the intent that the student can apply up to five times based on these categories, or is their reinstatement attempt limited to one category?
A: My understanding is that they have to pick a category to petition.
Q: Might I suggest this be written into the policy?
A: Sure.

Q: Line 411 states that reinstatement is not allowed for a second disqualification, doesn't that cover the previous question?
A: It is not quite the same thing. What was being asked was if in a single instance you could try all these ways to get back in.

Q: Why can't they try all five categories?
A: You would be willing to accept a petition from a student for extenuating circumstances at the same time they were taking courses to raise their GPA, and you would let them choose between the two?
Q: If they have the qualifications for them, why not allow them to?
A: If David Bruck says it's okay, who am I to argue.

Q: How about changing line 342 to say "on the basis of any one or more of the following five" and then they make their appeal all at once rather than appealing on one then appealing on another, and so on.
A: The committee will take that under consideration.
Q: On line 547, would you consider rewriting? I believe some teaching credential students will actually receive a degree from SJSU. Maybe you could say, "If the teaching credential program does not yield a degree"?
A: I see your point, you can actually get both a degree and a teaching credential.

C. **Professional Standards Committee (PS) –**
Senator Peter presented *AS 1611, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds S02-8, Information Technology Resources Responsible Use Policy (Final Reading)*

The Senate voted and AS 1611 passed as written (34-0-0).

Senator Peter presented *AS 1616, Policy Recommendation, Amending S15-6, To Clarify Procedures for Recruitment Committees (First Reading).*
Senator Peter explained that the PS Committee had requested this policy recommendation come to the Senate as a Final Reading, but he had mistakenly put First Reading on it. This will require a two-thirds vote in favor by the Senate.

Senator Peter presented a motion to suspend the rules and make AS 1616 a Final Reading. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the Peter motion passed (21-6-0).

Senator Mathur presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to add, "be cancelled" at the end of line 57.

Senator Curry presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change, "(and his designees)" on line 55 to read, "(and his/her designees)".

Senator Laker presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change line 36 to read, "...shall be recorded, shared with, ...".

Senator Lee presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to remove, "When committee recommendations are not unanimous," from lines 37 and 38.

The Senate voted and AS 1616 passed as amended (29-0-3).

Senator Peter presented *AS 1618, Policy Recommendation, Amends S15-7, To Clarify Secret Ballots for Choosing RTP Committees (Final Reading).*

Senator Peter presented a motion to move AS 1618 to a final reading. The motion was seconded. The Senate voted and the Peter motion passed with a two-thirds vote (26-2-0).

The Senate voted and AS 1618 passed as written (28-0-1).

Senator Peter presented *AS 1619, Policy Recommendation, Adopting New SOTE and SOLATE Instruments (First Reading).*

Questions:

Q: Could you please expand on the discussion you may have had in committee on question 14?
A: Of course it is subjective. Everything on the survey is subjective, but it may give you an idea of what the student thinks.
Q: Did SERB have a chance to talk over the question of "How would you describe your efforts in this course?" and why is that on the survey?
A: There seemed to be some need to get from the students how much effort they were putting into the class, because some faculty felt their courses were being graded very low by students that were not participating, so this was an attempt to get some measurement of how the student viewed their efforts in the course.

Q: On the SOLATE question number 14, "Did any other student attempt to influence your answers on the survey?," can you explain your rationale for collecting that data and how that information would be used?
A: That question also appears on the SOTE. These are flags, so that people in Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics (IEA) can find out if there has been some kind of coercion. This information is not required or reported.

Q: Item 18 on the SOTE asked students to self-report on how many hours they spent outside of class on course related activity, and it says, "(NOTE: This will be programmed to be answered as a number field, and the course units will be added to the report, allowing users to easily divide the answer by the actual course units to generate Carnegie Units," did I understand you correctly that everything after the informational items is not part of the SOTE report that faculty will receive?
A: That is my understanding, but let me ask Senator Lee from SERB.
A: My understanding is that everything from 14 on would go to faculty.
Q: So then the faculty member would see if the student answered that the faculty member had attempted to influence the student as well?

A: Yes. I asked this question to the Chair of SERB and was told the pros outweighed the cons and that this was important information that should go out.

Q: Is it the intention of SERB to use this information for institutional reporting?
A: The intention was to get faculty feedback that would help, and it would be useful to department chairs to report back to Graduate and Undergraduate Programs (GUP) the number of hours per credit unit per week that students report working on classwork.
A: The PS Committee was not unified in its understanding of how the data would be used on that point. Most members of the PS Committee would like to receive that data for their personal use. A few members were skeptical about putting that data to institutional use. It might be helpful for IEA to clarify how that data might be used for the final reading.

Q: It would certainly help me decide how to vote if SERB included information on which of these questions would come back to the faculty member and which questions would be used for other purposes.
A: The PS Committee will inform SERB. We cannot change the questions, but we could insert a Resolved clause about how the data would be used.

Q: I've heard various answers to this question, but I'd like this in the minutes. There are a lot of people concerned about SOTE questions because they are asking about teaching instead of learning. I understand it is difficult to measure learning on a survey of this nature, but I would argue it is just as hard to measure teaching. My preference would be to have the whole SOTE be a survey of learning. I'd like a response to this.
A: The PS Committee asked SERB to include questions about learning and the response was that there have been some studies done and students are notoriously poor at judging their own learning.

Q: What policy says that SOTES can't be amended, is it this one?
A: No, it is the teaching evaluation policy.

Q: The SOTES are supposed to be about teaching effectiveness and the questions from 14 on really aren't about teaching effectiveness. As all of us that deal with surveys know, one item influences other items on the survey. We are now increasing the length by about one-third, and I think decreases student interest in completing the survey. I also think that some of these questions have the potential to drive the answers to other questions.
A: If you want to approve this when it comes back, that is fine. If there is enough concern, it could be referred to SERB with instructions. The third option is to amend some of the Resolved clauses without touching the questions.

Q: Given the short time frame to approve, can we table this and have a working session with the Senate. This might be something appropriate for a Senate Retreat.
A: That is my suggestion that if it is referred back to SERB with instructions, you put in the instructions all of the concerns you'd like to see fixed. That would be for the next Senate meeting. This meeting is just for questions.
Q: What mechanisms does IEA or SERB have to do anything about connecting what someone's performance was on older SOTES compared to these SOTES?

A: In the teaching criteria of the RTP policy, there are a couple of different levels of achievement that identifies improvement from prior norms. That is built into the RTP policy. In terms of what SERB can do, in our last revision of the teaching evaluation policy we gave them broad latitude to design a variety of norms.

Q: On line 341 where it specifies, "(NOTE: This will be programmed to be answered as a number field, ..." does that mean there is a blank space there, or are there numbers already on it?
A: I presume it means you put in a number in a certain range. It originally came to PS with five different ranges to choose from and the PS Committee requested that SERB do something different, because that would have to be a question that would apply to a course that was one-unit, three-units, and six-units. That is why SERB inserted the number field.
Q: Where it specifies that, "the course units will be added to the report, allowing users to easily divide the answer by the actual course units ...," does this mean a report will be generated after everything, and the users are the people that get the report?
A: I'm not clear about this either.

Q: There is a perception that the SOTES have declined in ranking with the new online SOTES and there is also a perception that there is a correlation between grades and quality of teaching, e.g. that students perceive the higher their grade the better the teaching. Where would one go to find those kind of answers if indeed there has been deflation in the SOTES and inflation because of the grades?
A: There has been deflation when the electronic SOTES went into effect the drop was about $3/10^{th}$ of a point. This is why we re-normed to reflect that. That's why we sent a memo out saying judge according to norms and not raw numbers, because the norms are quite different between the old paper SOTES and online SOTES. With regard to the relationship between grades and SOTES that was one of the major concerns the PS Committee had at the time we revised the last policy, so you can see now a little chart at the bottom showing exactly how each student that got each grade evaluated you in the course. Generally speaking, there is a relationship but it is a slight relationship. Many people that study teaching evaluations argue that it is appropriate that there is a relationship, because people that learn more ought to like you better.

D. **Organization and Government Committee (O&G) –**
Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1605, Senate Management Resolution, Electronic Voting (Final Reading).*

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change "cal" to "call" in line 61.

Senator Frazier presented an amendment to change the word "shall" to "can" in line 22.
The amendment was not seconded.

Senator Frazier presented an amendment to change "shall" to "may" in line 26. The amendment was seconded. Senator Frazier withdrew his amendment.

Senator Frazier presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change the last Resolved clause to read, "Resolved: That except in circumstances where a secret ballot is necessary, when electronic devices are used for official voting it will be done in parallel with an unofficial show of hands."

The Senate voted and AS 1605 passed as amended (27-4-0).

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1603, Policy Recommendation, Committee Obligations and Senate Membership (Modification of Bylaw 6) (Final Reading).*

The Senate voted and AS 1603 passed as written (30-0-0).

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1590, Senate Management Resolution, Remote Attendance at Senate and Committee Meetings (Final Reading).*

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change, "thus the bylaws place" in line 41 to read, "thus the standing rule places."

Senator Peter presented an amendment to lines 66 through 71 to strike, "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. Such accommodations should be rare. The individual requesting remote attendance is responsible for making all necessary arrangements needed to facilitate remote attendance." The amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Peter Amendment passed (26-5-0).

The Senate voted and AS 1590 passed as amended (31-0-0).

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1621, Policy Recommendation, Departmental Voting Rights (First Reading).*

Questions:

Q: What is the status of a permanent faculty member on temporary assignment to another department?
A: You would have a full vote in your department of record, but no vote in the temporary assignment.
Q: Why should I have less of a vote than a temporary faculty member in that department?
A: Good question, I'll take it back to the committee.
Q: A common thing that I see across the campus is that there are faculty that are pulled

from their home departments to chair other departments and they are still very involved in their home department, will they now only get to vote in the department they are chairing? A: This was a point discussed at length in the Organization and Government Committee, and we decided to put it forward as you stated. You would have full voting rights in the department being chaired, but no voting rights in the home department. This is one of the reasons the Organization and Government Committee invites your feedback particularly on items 5 and 7.

       E. University Library Board (ULB) – No Report.

VII.   **Special Committee Reports –**
Highlights of the Faculty Diversity Report by Senator Elna Green, AVP for Faculty Affairs are as follows:

The number one reason that faculty gave for declining our employment offer was the cost of housing. We have competitive salaries, but not in the context of the cost of living in the area. Another challenge is the state of our facilities, STEM in particular. We also have Proposition 209 which says we are not allowed to do opportunity hires, and we cannot set quotas. What we can do is to work to diversify the applicant pools.

We have a diversity master plan. This includes our guiding principles for the campus since 2009. This is our master plan for diversifying not only our faculty, but also the student body, the campus, and the curriculum. Faculty Affairs continues to follow the diversity master plan.

For faculty, the diversity master plan laid out a program of training and outreach and best practices. It included broadening the applicant pool by creating extra advertising and outreach, establishing faculty-in-residence programs, travel funds for recruitment activity, and extensive training for recruitment committees. Faculty Affairs is doing all of these things. Faculty Affairs has advertised in Blacks in Higher Education, Chronicle of Higher Education, Diverse Education, etc.

For the past two years Carlos Garcia has been the faculty-in-residence. Two new faculty-in-residence have been appointed for next year and they are Magdalena Barrera and Rebecca Burciaga. The faculty-in-residence work with the recruitment committees all year long and look for additional ways to do outreach and advertising. The also look for likely places to advertise where there might be a large number of graduate students in a particular area. The faculty-in-residence also participate in the training for the recruitment committees.

This year we had 66 searches approved by the Provost. Out of those 66 searches we hired 58 faculty. That is the largest number of new tenure and tenure/track faculty hired in a decade. The largest number of faculty ever hired was in 2005 when 68 tenure and tenure/track faculty were hired.

We have had 72 approved for recruitment this coming year, and as of today we have 46 signed contracts for next year. We have about 8 offers still out there waiting to come in, and about 10 recruitments still going on. However, we have had a lot of resignations. These are not

retirements, they are resignations. Last year we had 15 faculty resign. We are making gains in tenure and tenure/track density, but it is slow since we continue to lose faculty. The demographic profile of the 15 that we lost roughly parallels the demographic breakdown of the campus tenure and tenure/track faculty.

We had the largest percentage of female faculty hires this year at 58.6%. We had a larger percentage of white hires this year than in the past three years. The three-year breakdown of tenure and tenure/track hires over the past three years is 52.2% white, 30.4% minorities, and 17.4% unknown. The unknown category is troubling and is enough to make a difference if we knew where people might fall, but this is self-reported data. Other CSUs don't have as high a level of reporting "unknown" as SJSU does.

Out of the 58 hires this year, there were 14 international faculty. These included three from Canada, four from China, one from Iran, two from Russia, one from Serbia, two from S. Korea, and one from Turkey.

Data that you see on the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics (IEA) website is reported exactly how the Chancellor's Office requests the data. What this does is exclude a lot of people. The Chancellor's Office has asked us to report people that have a teaching assignment. If you are not in a teaching assignment for the Fall semester, then you get left out of the data. If you are a librarian or counselor, are out on a DIP or sabbatical that Fall semester, are on a leave of absence, or are a 1.0 Department Chair you do not get counted. In 2014, the number of those left out was pretty significant. There were 85 people that did not get counted. So you will often hear Faculty Affairs say a number that doesn't match what IEA has and this is because Faculty Affairs does include everyone.

Right now we have approximately 57% white, just under 10% unknown, and about one-third minority tenure and tenure/track faculty. We are very close to having 50/50 male and female tenure and tenure/track faculty this year. It is quite likely that with this next cycle of hiring we will get to 50/50.

Questions:

Q: You mentioned that we are different than other campuses in the unknown reporting, and I was wondering if we might have families that are multi-racial and multi-ethnic?
A: There is a "multi" category, but it does not let you combine different categories.

Q: Going from 5 recruitments a year to 60 recruitments a year is really an impressive job. I commend Faculty Affairs. Do you have any information about whether the disciplinary advertisements or the group-targeted advertisements are more helpful in getting people in?
A: Carlos Garcia is currently working on tracking the places where faculty are reporting that they saw the ads. Faculty Affairs is hoping this will give them some more information about where to spend advertising dollars next year.

Q: Were any reasons given for the resignations?

A: We don't have a formal exit interview, but we do often hear from people about where they are going and what they are going to do. They are often going somewhere they will get a bump in pay, or a bump in status or rank, etc. However, Faculty Affairs does not have a formal survey instrument about that.

Q: One of the issues I think we need to address is to provide role models for our students. We need people that have shared experiences with the students that come here. I'm wondering what the extent to which the minority overlap with the international hires, because I think there is a difference between being from a traditionally underrepresented group in the U.S. and being from a foreign country. I'm also wondering what fields the women we are hiring are in?
A: Yes, there is some overlap between the category for minority and the international category. Not all international faculty are classified as minority. As far as the breakdown by department, Faculty Affairs did not do that but the information is on the IEA website.

VIII.   **New Business – None.**

IX.   **State of the University Announcements. Questions. In rotation.**

    A. Provost – No report.

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

    C. Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA) – Not Present

    D. Associated Students President –

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

    F. CSU Statewide Senators –

X.   **Adjournment –** The meeting adjourned at 4:58 p.m.