

**SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE  
2020/2021  
Agenda**

**March 1, 2021, 2:00 pm – 5:00 pm**

**via Zoom: <https://sjsu.zoom.us/j/81676110749>**

If you would like to attend this meeting, please contact the Chair ([Ravisha.Mathur@sjsu.edu](mailto:Ravisha.Mathur@sjsu.edu)) or the Senate Administrator ([Eva.Joice@sjsu.edu](mailto:Eva.Joice@sjsu.edu)) for the password.

- I. Call to Order and Roll Call:**
- II. Land Acknowledgement:**
- III. Approval of Minutes:**
- IV. Communications and Questions:**
  - A. From the Chair of the Senate
  - B. From the President of the University
- V. Executive Committee Report:**
  - A. Minutes of the Executive Committee –
  
  - B. Consent Calendar –
  
  - C. Executive Committee Action Items –
- VI. Unfinished Business:**

**University Policy S1510 , Revisions to SJSU Library Policy  
(Initial Reading)**

- B. University Library Board (ULB):
- C. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):
- D. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):
- E. Professional Standards Committee (PS):



2020-2021 Academic Senate Minutes  
February 8, 2021

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

Ex Officio: Del Casino, Wong(Lau), Papazian  
None

---

IV. Communications and Questions –

A. From the Chair of the Senate:

Chair Mathur announced that nominating petitions and seat information for our Senate Elections have been sent to faculty. The deadline to submit a nominating petition is February 19, 2021. If your seat term is up and you are not interested in running for another term, please let the Senate Administrator or Senate Chair know. Please also encourage your colleagues to run for the Senate.

The faculty award committees have been doing their work diligently. They will be submitting their nominations to President Papazian by this coming Wednesday, if they have not already done so.

Vice Provost Anagnos has sent out a message to request campus feedback on the Draft GE Guidelines, please review and provide any comments. C&R will review these feedback and utilize it to update the guidelines.

Chair Mathur reminded the Senate that the Senate Retreat

COVID-related challenges at SJSU. We are waiting for some guidance from the federal government regarding funding for undocumented students as well as international students. These students were not eligible in the last go around. It is not clear that that was the only way to read the statute. We are hoping we will be able to extend some of those dollars to these populations.

Robust negotiations continue in congress right now on a third CARES package. This would be part of President Biden's \$1.9 trillion relief/rescue package. This is looking to be just under \$40 billion nationally which is significantly more than we have seen before. What we are hearing is that we would be expected to receive about 50% of those dollars. What that amount is we don't know yet. These funds would be a direct pass through to our students to provide emergency financial support for them. We have good systems in place and we were able to distribute those funds the first time pretty quickly. We are hoping and pushing hard for our undocumented and international student populations. As we learn more we will get the word out. This would really help us. We were able to use CARES dollars to invest in the faculty workshops over the summer and we are looking at ways to continue to do that to provide support for students. We are also looking at things like ourhops Ae-0.7 0

challenges/concerns for us in order to improve the climate for everyone on campus. This committee is a very large and diverse group, especially excited about the number of students on the committee, seven students. I (President Papazian) appreciate the CDO's leadership in this group. Many thanks to all nominees for their interest. We still keep the list to utilize as individuals rotate off this committee.

The insurrection on the capitol on December 6, 2020 brought challenges to our democracy. This feeds into our work on systemic racism and bias on campus. We will continue to work on this going forward. The committee on Community Safety and Policing is writing its report right now and preparing to submit their recommendations. Once that is done we will review and begin a process of implementing change.

Questions:

Q: Recently there was a newspaper article about how the Athletics Director is under investigation due to complaints from employees about working conditions. Can you share any information about this with us?

A: Sure, we haven't received any notice of an investigation. It's a newspaper article. There is a process in place that we are working through as we begin to open up the campus. There will be many questions around repopulation and what that looks like. This is something we are working through with University Personnel, FD&O, etc. to ensure we have a consistent and equitable approach. That process is underway. We read that, but we haven't actually heard that or gotten any notice from the county. That is where that stands right now. We are in active and deep conversations with the county right now about the vaccine. The county is very interested in using our site as a vaccination site. They like our spaces. We would like to be able to make this service available. It would be a public site for the downtown community. It is a way for us to give back. There are no other vaccination sites downtown. We are just in deep conversations right now, but are optimistic this might happen.

V. Executive Committee Report:

A. Minutes of the Executive Committee:

EC Minutes of November 30, 2020 – No questions

EC Minutes of January 11, 2021 – No questions

EC Minutes of January 25, 2021 – No questions

B. Consent Calendar:

Consent Calendar of February 8, 2021—AVC Marachi amended the consent calendar to add a member to the Campus Planning Board (Junelyn Peoples). There was no dissent to the consent calendar as presented and amended by AVC Marachi.

C. Executive Committee Action Items:

Chair Mathur presented University Policy, S21-1, Time-Limited Amendment of Research Oversight. With the retirement of AVP Stacks in December 2020, it was noted that there were three policies that named the AVP Research as the designated institutional officer for research oversight or as the institutional officer for research misconduct. The Senate Office received a referral to update the three policies from the Vice President of Research and Innovation (VPRI), Mohammad Abousalem, in the last week before the winter break due to AVP Stacks retirement. The Organization and Government Committee Chair, Karthika Sasikumar, worked closely with the VPRI to develop a temporary measure to put into place to ensure continuity in research oversight. The Executive Committee acting on behalf of the Senate was asked to provide coverage temporarily until permanent amendments could be brought to the full Senate by O&G. Those three amendments will be heard later today. It is very rare for the Executive Committee to take 6.3 (por) o vving b( Clf of RSe

appointments be evaluated in both departments separately in unless there is a campus policy, which provides for a joint committee. And, rather than making our dozen or so joint appointments jumped from two different hoops the idea was to create a single committee so they would be treated more or less like everyone else, a committee that would be composed of numbers from both of their departments. In order to do that we needed define what a joint appointment was, and then we secondly needed to set up a simple procedure for creating these joint committees. So, these two policy recommendations have to come separately, one has an amendment to the appointmr18.3 (ent)-11.4 (s)-5.9 ( )0.6 (s)-6 (ep)-16.7 (ar)-6.28 (m)10. [(r)sb3 (o )o armtng nt



A motion was made to approve AS 1797. The motion was seconded. The

an amendment that was friendly to the body to change “procedures” in line

faculty for solving the problem in the second Resolved Clause and not something more like the tone of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Resolved Clause?

A:



Q: On line 37, where it says simultaneous, the unintended consequence of this seems to me that we would have to delay textbook adoption or anything else until it is available in all modalities. I don't think that is what is intended, but I wonder how you take the legal standard?

A: Definitely, we can talk about that, but that is the legal standard. The federal law says it must be simultaneously.

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

A. University Library Board (ULB): No report.

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

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

Senator Sullivan-Green presented AS 1802, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to F20-2, Grading Changes to Support Maximum Flexibility for SJSU Students During the Prolonged COVID -19 Pandemic (Final Reading).

The chancellor's office reviewed the work that we did in December and raised concern that we were automatically changing a WU grade to a W grade; they noted that this is not permissible. There were also issue regarding failing grades as related to Academic Integrity concerns. Students have been notified, that if they did receive a failing grade due to an academic integrity violation that the failing grade does still stand and that this policy and F20-2 do not affect those grades.

Q: I had a question regarding changing it to no credit. Will there be a petition process to change the no credit to a W or would that student then be stuck with the no credit for a class?

A: This amendment does not affect the student's ability to request a withdrawal from a class or the Semester, this is just changing the automatic process, but the student still absolutely has the right to petition to take any grades and turn them to an actual withdraw or a W.

Senator Sullivan-Green presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to add another Resolved Clause before the existing Resolved Clause to read, "Resolved: That F20-2 be amended to remove the language as shown: That SJSU should, so far as is legally possible, convert all WU grades in Fall 2020 to W grades." Senator Masegian presented an amendment that was friendly to the body to change the last Resolved Clause to read, "Resolved: That SJSU should consider, so far as legally possible, converting all grades of Unauthorized Withdrawal (WU) to No Credit (NC) for Spring 2021." Senator Van Selst presented an amendment to change line 31 of the last Resolved Clause to add, "...for Winter and Spring 2021." Senator Riley presented an amendment to the Van Selst Amendment to change it to read, "...for Winter, Spring, and Summer 2021." The Senate voted on the Riley Amendment to the Van Selst Amendment and it passed (34-13-1). The Senate voted on the Van

Selst/Riley Amendment and it passed (37-9-0). The Senate voted and AS 1802 passed as amended (45-1 -1).

D. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

Senator Peter presented AS 1804, Policy Recommendation, Amendment E to University Policy S15-8, Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and Standards to Enhance Service to Students (First Reading).

In 2015, we separated "Service" into its own category for RTP evaluation. It used to be combined with another category and then specified four different descriptions of service. Somewhere we dropped all of the old language about educational equity activities from the previous policy. This will restore educational equity in service to students (both definition and descriptors).

Questions:

Q: When we do a change to the RTP policy, what happens to people currently in the pipeline? Is this a policy that then takes effect for Fall 2021 documents/dossiers? On the implementation side, what does that look like?

A: Under the terms of the CBA you cannot change the criteria and standards while the process is going on. Anything that we might adopt during this year would not be implemented until the beginning of the next RTP cycle.

However, you are correct. Unless we were to adopt some phased in implementation these changes would apply beginning in the fall. Phasing in these changes was appropriate when we had a wholesale revision in 2015. This is relatively limited and opens up options rather than imposing requirements other than that one sentence in baseline. I think it would be pretty hard to argue that faculty documenting they had some service to students would be over the top.

look at something you drafted and consider it in committee.

Q: I think it is a larger issue. I think we need to have conversations with our colleagues beyond the Senate. It almost rests at the question of the social justice mission of the institution. If that is a core value of the institution then I don't know why we would say "some" or "may" in a policy that elevates the question. I think there is an opportunity to have a larger campus conversation about this very question and how it aligns with our overall strategic plan and our ethics for how we want the campus to run. I appreciate the effort and the work.

A: We would appreciate suggestions, which is why this is a first reading and why we asked the administration to chime in. Please send us your ideas.

C: I totally agree with the points just brought up regarding the language and the strength and centrality of closing equity gaps in service. However, there is another important issue for me. There is an implied algorithm about what constitutes the difference between baseline good and excellent. I want to challenge you to think about when we say that if you get appointed to a committee for example, candidates of color or other marginalized candidates have very little control over who appoints them in some ways. I have an assumption that people are working in systemically inequitable situations. I think it is possible for someone to do excellent service within their own department or program that may not stretch to the rest of the university. The standards that differentiate between baseline good and excellent have to have within them some value laden understandings about privilege that go unrecognized. I wouldn't want someone to be punished because they were entThe unprop(dr

was thought that it should parallel the scholarship that is the impact or scope of the service so the baseline was generally considered apart from the department and considered to be the most basic level. The service activities out to the college, or the community, or your professional organizations were considered a higher level of achievement. What I'm hearing is that basic rubric for service is itself problematic.

C: I would like to remind the committee that there is a wealth of activity happening at the university on the staff side trying to address some of the educational equity issues, and it would be nice if that was also listed as a possible way faculty could satisfy their service requirement by working with campus partners on the staff side to try and address these issues. a0.6 (a ) pec0.7 (t)-10.7 (





to make our reference to general sections that tend not to have changed over the years. One of the problems with the 2010 policy is that it was filled with quotations from the CBA two or three agreements ago. We have tried to craft

E.



Q: We are in the process of fall planning right now and people are asking about modalities, so up to what point can a modality be changed if we need to?

A: They can be changed all the way up to the first day of classes, and they can be changed as we did in Spring of 2020 in the middle of the semester if need be. We are planning based on what we know today. Things could change in 2 months, 4 months, 6 months. There is absolutely the potential that things will change. We might have to have more online classes, or less online classes. We might have different configurations for using classrooms. This will obviously be driven by health and safety questions. Great question.

C. Associated Students President:

AS President Delgadillo reported that AS is still waiting for the university to approve their AS Board approved budget for 2021-2022. At the end of Fall 2020, the Cesar Chavez Community Action Center was approved by the AS Board of Directors for a universal design renovation at the campus community garden. We will be the first CSU to implement a universal design project on our campus and our community garden. The hope for the universal design concept is to allow the garden to be accessed, understood, and used to the greatest extent possible by all people regardless of their age, size, ability, or disability and more importantly to bring light to the intersectionality of ableism and environmental justice. The universal design project is moving fast with their anticipated completion date by the end of February or early March. The universal design renovation will include an ADA accessible entrance and an open air welcome space, an ADA Ramp, an ADA porta potty, the front half of the garden will be paved for universal design accessibility, there are raised beds, an ADA compliant sink and kitchen, and so much more. AS is very excited about this project. AS election applications are underway and they are due February 26, 2021. If any of you know any student that would be a great fit, please encourage them to apply.

exciafaec5.6 (l)-112 (A6.7 (y))



Executive Committee Minutes  
February 1, 2021

h.P <</MC,ute

Guest: Barrera

1. From the Chair:

Chair Mathur announced that Senate Election materials went out last Thursday in accordance with our scheduled Election Calendar. You may use the Adobe signature fields and pass them off to DocuSign or upload to DocuSign. If anyone needs help, please contact Chair Mathur or the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice.

The Senate Retreat is Friday, February 12, 2021 from 9 a.m. to Noon. There will be a focus on the post-pandemic university as well as games, such as Jeopardy, and door prizes. Please be sure and RSVP to Vice Chair McKee's calendar invite.

The first spring 2021 Senate meeting is next Monday, February 8, 2021. Please be sure to submit policy recommendations and resolutions to the Senate Administrator by Tuesday of the week at the very latest.

2. The Executive Committee approved the consent agenda (Executive Committee Agenda)

Johnson vacated his application. It comes to realize our most vulnerable look like the rollout as we move more in about while making chance to be answered in in what way. think it will h

in their projections. And, again the COVID-19 \$1.9 trillion package does have dollars for state and local government as well. This could also provide some support. Part of the mandatory cost is for implementation of AB 1460, the Ethnic Studies requirement.



Q: I wanted to add to the encouragement to rollout information. People are asking questions. I really thought we would hear something on January 4, 2021 when we came back. There wasn't any information and that is okay I understand, but I did hear reputable news that there was a poll taken and 25% of those polled did not intend on getting the vaccine even when available. I'm very concerned because people are asking questions and it would be the responsible thing for us to get this information out to our students so they can pass it on to their folks as well. As far as the insurance thing, I started asking my insurance provider as well. I actually have an appointment now for March. I think it is important to give out updates on a weekly basis as to where we are.

A; [President] Thank you. We will get together with our staff and put together something. You are right it is a moving target and it is hard to know where to go.

C: [CDO] We know that vaccine hesitancy is a real cultural, community-based, and equity problem. By getting information out early, hopefully by the time the CDC gets to all of us for vaccinations in late summer, people have had time to think about all the information. We have heard from several different faculty members that have said they will not be getting the vaccine when it comes out because of their concerns about the speed it was produced and its safety. We have been trying to speak with them about it and they are in the age group the CDC says have a high vaccine hesitancy rate. California is actually doing fairly well. We only have a 20% vaccine hesitancy rate, whereas across the country the rate is 56%. We are doing better than other states.

4. Policy Committee Updates:

A. Instruction and Student Affairs (I&SA):

I&SA will be bringing a resolution to the Senate to amend F20-2 to change the WU grade to NC in compliance with the Chancellor's Office instruction on February 8, 2021. I&SA will be talking today about whether we should bring the Credit/No Credit resolution. I will bring to I&SA the discussions we had in Executive Committee and EO 1037. I will explain that all those limits will still apply. We will see what everyone says and if in agreement, we will bring it to the Senate on February 8, 2021. If not, we will send the referral back explaining the reasons. This would not be my preference.

B. Professional Standards Committee (PS):

PS will bring the two policy amendments to the Senate on February 8, 2021 that we did not get to at the last Senate meeting in December dealing with the issue of joint appointments. In addition, there could be as many as three additional policy amendments. PS spent much of January meeting with subcommittees working on the Lecturer policy. We hope to bring this as a first reading at the February 8, 2021 Senate meeting3 (er)-3 ( p)20 o(n)20 (g at)2 ( t) 7.d ( b)-6 odd

member and gains the benefit of it. I'm very interested in how you will go about this. It is a very hard issue to resolve.

A: I agree with you entirely. I have disagreed in principle with the notion of joint



C: [Provost] It is totally an online program as I understand it. You are looking at about \$24,000 on the main campus. Again, the Pell eligibility rate is likely to be higher in this program which will reduce the cost. From a planning perspective, it is very simple. Every class and every unit cost x number of dollars. The other thing I said is we can negotiate with various school districts to create discounts ourselves in special session.

Q: Wouldn't that be an equity issue then if we are doing that for certain people in the program and not for others? They are saying this could involve school districts, but would involve other audiences as well. I think that makes it even more problematic.

A: [Provost] If you want to get into an equity question, what is equity in this context? Is it everyone paying the same price, because everyone that goes to SJSU now doesn't pay the same price? The other question is do we differentiate the cost of the instruction? If you want to look through an equity lens, then you should be paying a lot more for an Engineering degree than for a Humanities degree at SJSU, a lot more. We don't do that right now. The costs are complicated. The question of equity also ties to access. Are we going to create programs that are fully online and accessible to adult learners with a fixed price model that allows them to pace out their courses over a period of time without having to worry about things like fee increases and other kinds of things like that, or are you going to allow an online space to emerge where adult learners can have access to an education they never had before. Is that the equity? If it's just in a pricing model then we need to have a much larger conversation. We would have to blow up the entire pricing model of the CSU to produce equity relative to cost of instruction.

C: The concern that I have is based on the target audience. These are people who work in K-12. They don't have degrees and probably have families and they are not making that much. If they are Pell eligible then that is great, but I just think if you are going to promote this everything needs to be on the table so the students getting into this know what they are getting into. If they have to take out excessive student loans, they need to know they aren't going to come out of this with a teaching credential. If they drop out and have student loans, they need to know they are going to have to pay them.

C: [Provost] I agree, but I would much rather have them advised by our student financial aid counselors than National University or Ashford and that is where many of these students end up going to. They go into space in for profit education that gouge them and take in federal dollars at huge rates. We provide no opportunity to address this at all in the CSU right now so for me where equity and access are brought into this conversation, we are providing them access and affordability. We need to have special session financial aid counselors dedicated to degree completion students. Maybe what we need is a larger infrastructure conversation about how we support adult learners at this university. I think there is a lot of value and equity here. If those are questions that need to be answered we can work on this.

C: There are plenty of students who have dropped out for a long time and whose courses they took at that time don't meet the requirements any longer in the CSU. So we will need dedicated counselors to work with these people who can make a good analysis as to how long it will take them to be eligible for these programs.

Q: If special session students aren't paying fees for access to our infrastructure, then they would have to have their own infrastructure correct?

A: [Provost] No, we tax back the campus out of special session to pay for the components we are talking about. It is tax embedded in special session. There is support. The price per unit is significantly lower than market if you look at ASU, National, and Arizona. They are charging \$525 per unit and even one of our CSU's is charging \$625 per unit. We are just trying to get to a sustainable place. This is an expansion of access issue, which in my opinion needs to be tied into the equity conversation.

C: That is missing from this application.

C: [Provost] Maybe it isn't missing from the application, but that we haven't explained better the overall context of how we will do this work as a campus. Maybe I need to put this down on paper, then every program won't have to answer this themselves. These are

really institutional questions not College of Education issues. My team and I need to clarify what this infrastructure looks like to drive this and then you can frame each program in it. Would that be helpful? In the meantime, I'm more than happy to talk to the C&R crew.

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

As you may remember at the January 11, 2021 meeting, O&G brought some temporary amendments to the research policies. Today, O&G will be considering permanent amendments to those policies to bring to the full Senate on February 8, 2021.

5. Presentation by Dr. Magdalena Barrera, Interim Vice Provost for Faculty Success:

I wanted to come today and provide you with BIPOC faculty feedback on the RTP process and let you know some of the things my office has going on to address this feedback and then ask some critical questions about how we support our policies. I shared with you a handout that summarizes the feedback that we got from a special session with about 30 Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) faculty members. We asked them questions about their racial and ethnic identities and how it relates to them and their professional lives and then what their experience has been at SJSU. Key issues and themes that emerged from our meetings:

that can provide support and guidance for evaluators who are looking at their colleague's materials.

In reviewing this feedback there are questions we need to ask ourselves:

1. What can and should be addressed immediately, and what may require more thorough discussions and planning over time?
2. What are ways of partnering with my colleagues so that their voices, experiences, and ideas are integrated into the work of making RTP more transparent and equitable?
3. What can we do to enable a social shift on campus especially when it comes to evaluators serving on these committees, so they really embrace the honor and responsibility of their role?

Questions/Comments:

Q: Thank you so much for your presentation and the work that you've done. In the event that you have described, I'm interested in process and outreach. I wonder if there are faculty who are BIPOC who are not aware of these events? I'm involved in the Senate and very active in RTP, and I had never heard about this before today. In terms of representation of voices, you said it went out to faculty of color but how do we identify who was included in the sample? Also, are the folks that participated aware that their input is being shared?

A: Thanks for those questions. As far as the people invited, we tried to piece together a list of folks that we knew were BIPOC and in the invitations that went out we asked people to spread the information by word of mouth. That is one answer. As far as the representation of voices, the people who attended the sessions were different ranks and identities. They are aware their feedback would be shared.

SJSU Academic Senate  
 March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2021 Consent Calendar

Add					
Committee Name	Name	Zip	Phone	Term	Seat (Title)
Alcohol & Drug Abuse Prevention	Sofia Moede	0065	43394	EXO	Seat N- Staff-at-Large (nonMPP from Academic Affairs)
Curriculum and Research Committee	Mohamed Abousalem	0022	43318	EXO	Seat A- AVP Research
Program Planning Committee	Mohamed Abousalem	0022	43318	EXO	Seat C- AVP, Office of Research

[-Øâëu¿}7ip 1,™"iX0 ar i#60 Y'r i0V0 Y'r i4 0 Y'r i8 0 Y'r iA^0 ar ip 0 Y'r iFProgram Planning Committee

Remove					
Committee Name	Name	Zip	Phone	Term	Seat (Title)
	Pam Stacks	0022	42488	EXO	Seat G- AVP, Office of Research
International Programs & Students	Xiaojing Liu	0054	46514	2021	SeatJ- Health and Human Sciences

1 SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY  
2 Academic Senate  
3 Organization and Government Committee  
4 March 1, 2021  
5 Final Reading  
6

AS 1806

## 7 POLICY RECOMMENDATION

### 8 9 Amendment D to S15-10, Revisions to SJSU Library Policy

10

11 Amends: University Policy S15-10

12

13 Effective : Immediately

14

15 Whereas: The University Library Board (ULB) “serves as liaison between faculty and  
16 students and the Library administration, faculty, and staff; examines the  
17 relationships between the Library and the general faculty, the various  
18 colleges and the programs of the University, for the purpose of  
19 recommending improvements in Library services and policy, as well as the  
20 stature of the Library,” as per 2.5.2 of the Library Policy; and

21

22 Whereas: The Board has representation for Library faculty, graduate and  
23 undergraduate students, as well as faculty representing the various  
24 colleges of the University; and

25

26 Whereas: The Library staff play an increasing and integral role in the delivery of  
services and the formulation of Library policy; and a sentence be added amending 2.6  
33 tenure-track) university library faculty with  
specializations, and two members of the

34

35 members will serve for staggered three-year terms.”

36

37

38 Approved : February 22, 2021

39 Vote: 12-0-0

40 Present : Altura, Birrer, de Bourbon, Grosvenor, Higgins, Maciejewski,  
41 McClory, Millora, Okamoto, Sasikumar, Taylor, Thompson

42 Absent : None

43 Financial impact : None anticipated

44 Workload impact : None anticipated



1 SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY  
2 Academic Senate  
3 Professional Standards Committee  
4 March 1, 2021  
5 First Reading

AS 1805

6  
7  
8 POLICY RECOMMENDATION

9  
10

Amendment E to University Policy, S15-8  
Retention, Tenure and Promotion for395 ngule or, oTo provide for “The Scholarship of Engagement

13

14

15 Resolved: That S15-8 be amended as indicated by the strikeout and underline in the  
16 following excerpt of the policy, renumbering existing paragraphs as  
17 appropriate; be it further

18

19 Resolved: That these changes become effective for the 2021-2022 academic year  
20 and not before.

21

22 Rationale: Beginning with the influential Boyer model of scholarship in the 1990s an  
23 increasing number of universities have expanded the range of  
24 achievements that can be considered as “scholarship.” One area, referred  
25 to by Boyer initially as “the scholarship of application” was renamed in a  
26 later edition as “the scholarship of engagement.” This category  
27 acknowledges the important role played when faculty expertise is  
28 “engaged” in the community. In this amendment we add the category of  
29 “The Scholarship of Engagement” based upon descriptions used at a  
30 number of other universities (Purdue, Oregon State, and Michigan State in  
31 part) to make clear that SJSU values and will reward this kind of activity.  
32 Professional Standards holds that engaged scholarship is particularly  
33 appropriate for SJSU, which seeks to deploy a diverse faculty with  
34 expertise that can benefit the many professional and local communities of  
35 which we are an integral part.

36

37

38

39

40

41

Approved:

82 POLICY RECOMMENDATION

83 Amendment E to University Policy, S15 -8

84 Retention, Tenure and Promotion for Regular Faculty Employees: Criteria and  
85 Standards

86 To provide for "The Scholarship of Engagement"

87

88 2.3 Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement

89

90 2.3.1 The second basic category for evaluation is scholarly/artistic/professional  
91 achievement. Such contributions to a faculty member's discipline or professional  
92 community, or application of scholarly expertise to improve the community, are  
93 expected for continuation and advancement in the university. This category is  
94 subdivided into several areas for ease of description and reference. ~~three areas:~~  
95 ~~scholarly, artistic, and professional; this division is for ease of reference only.~~—These  
96 ~~three areas~~ are not perfectly distinct and some candidates will demonstrate their  
97 disciplinary expertise within two or more ~~all three~~ of the areas. Some achievements  
98 may have characteristics of more than one area. The overarching principle should be to  
99 reward significant scholarly/artistic/professional achievement regardless of the form it  
100 may take.

101

123 in progress and unpublished work should be assessed whenever possible. In cases  
124 where there is no external evaluation of an achievement the department committee will  
125 review the work and indicate the extent of its quality and significance.  
126