

**SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC SENATE**

2017/2018

Agenda

April 9, 2018, 200 pm – 500 pm

Engineering 285/287

- I. Call to Order and Roll Call –
- II. Approval of Minutes :  
Senate Minutes of March 12, 2018.
- III. Communications and Questions:
  - A. From the Chair of the Senate
  - B. From the President of the University
- IV. Executive Committee Report :
  - A. Minutes of the Executive Committee  
Executive Committee Minutes of March 5, 2018  
Executive Committee Minutes of March 19, 2018
  - B. Consent Calendar –
  - C. Executive Committee Action Items –  
Approval of the Elections Calendar for Spring 2019
- V. Unfinished Business:
  - A. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):  
AS 1688, Policy Recommendation , Rescind F83 -10 Entry- Level  
Mathematics (EL M) Examination; Sanctions; Probation (First Reading)  
  
AS 1689, Policy Recommendation, Rescind S80- 9 Resource Analysis  
Required for Curricular Proposals (First Reading)
  - B. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):  
AS 1686, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds S66- 11, College Reports to  
Selective Service Boards (Final Reading)
  - C. Professional Standards Committee (PS):  
AS 1690, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to S13 -6 (Campus  
Awards)

- C. Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):  
AS 1691, Policy Recommendation, Rescind S09- 5, Priority Registration (First Reading)

AS 1694, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to University Policy S14-10 Master's Committee Structure and Processes and Thesis Embargoes (First Reading)

AS 1695, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to F88 -9 BA/BS Differentiation and Definition (First Reading)

- D. Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):  
AS 1696, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to S17 -13, Undergraduate Student Honors at SJSU (First Reading)

- E. Professional Standards Committee (PS):  
AS 1682, Policy Recommendation, Declaring our Support for Academic Freedom, Establishing the Academic Freedom Committee, and amending S99- 8 (Final Reading)

AS 1683, Policy Recommendation, Amendment A to F81 -7 "Appointment Procedures for Grant -Related Instructional Faculty of Exceptional Merit" (GRIF) (Final Reading)

VII. State of the University Announcements:

- A. AS President
- B. Provost
- C. Vice President for Administration and Finance
- D. Vice President for Student Affairs
- E. Chief Diversity Officer
- F. CSU Faculty Trustee (by standing invitation)
- G. Statewide Academic Senators

VIII. Special Committee Reports:

Report on Athletics by Professor Annette Nellen, Chair, Athletics Board, Professor Sen Chiao, the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR), Marie Tuite, the Director of Athletics, Jacquelyn Duysen, Associate Athletics Director for Compliance, and Eileen Dailey, Senior Associate Athletics Director, Student -Athlete Academic Services, Time Certain: 2:30 p.m.

IX. New Business:

X. Adjournment :

**2017/2018 Academic Senate**

**MINUTES**  
**March 12, 2018**

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

**Ex Officio:**

Present: Frazier,



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

Senator Schultz-Krohn presented *AS 1675, Policy Recommendation: Research, Scholarship, and Luz*

that requires students to take the ELM in their first semester of enrollment is in conflict with EO 1110. The issue that you are bringing up is an entirely different issue to undertake about the proper direction. What we are faced with today is a policy that requires students to take a test for something in their first semester that no longer exists.

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

Senator Sullivan Green presented *AS 1684, Policy Recommendation, Rescind S66-20, Control of Information Contained in Student Records (Final Reading)*.

Senator Rodan made a motion to suspend the rules and make AS 1684 a First Reading. The motion was seconded. *The Senate voted and the Rodan motion passed with 5 abstentions.*

Senator Sullivan-Green presented *AS 1685, Amendment A to S16-9, Section A, to include accessible syllabus template requirement, and Section B.1.e. to include expected hourly commitment for each unit of credit (Final Reading)*.

Senator Shifflett presented an amendment to lines 37 and 38 to strike, “and use the appropriate syllabus template format provided by the University.” The amendment was seconded. Senator Sen presented an amendment to the Shifflett amendment to change it to read, “and/or use the appropriate syllabus template format provided by the University to create their syllabus.” The Sen amendment to the Shifflett amendment was seconded. The Senate voted and the Sen amendment failed.

Senator Mathur called the question on the Shifflett amendment. The Senate voted and the Mathur motion passed with 4 Nays and No Abstentions. *The Senate voted*

~~and the Shifflett amendment passed with 67 Nays, (no) 51 Abstentions.~~



instead leave the principal work of policy and policy statements to the central work of the Senate.

**A:** There is no provision in the draft for the Academic Freedom Committee to be drafting policy. That remains with PS. This is primarily an educational and advisory committee. PS could change that if you think it is advisable.

**Q:** It may be then just a different title is needed.

**A:** PS will discuss this.

**Q:** Once upon a time there was a chapter of the AAUP here. I know this because the charter said you could only be chair for two years and Senator Norton and Senator Buzanski took turns chairing this committee. One function this group had was when faculty members had some administrative difficulties with academic freedom or were being charged with certain irregularities in their teaching or what not, our local chapter of AAUP would come to their defense. Since you have also mentioned that organization here in your report might the Academic Freedom





coded memorandum that the CSU issued that regulates this particular program. There were no questions.

**E. Organization and Government Committee (O&G):**

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1680, Policy Recommendation, Rescinds S90-13 (At Large Committee Appointments) (Final Reading)*.

**The Senate voted and AS 1680 was approved unanimously.**

Senator Shifflett presented *AS 1681, Policy Recommendation, Rescind F71-14: Acting Appointments: Vice Presidents or Deans (Final Reading)*.

**The Senate voted and AS 1681 passed with No Nays and 1 Abstention.**

you accessed it in Canvas, but you would also get additional information. First, you get the average course grade. Next, you get the average grade of the students who completed the survey as compared to the average grade of the students that didn't complete the survey. This is interesting information we did not have before. Then if you scroll down from there you get the college norms. The current state is that we can only compare the individual mean for any given class to the department and university norm. SERB is working on it. The college norms are at the end of the report.

Just a quick comparison of the report we were using before and what we have now. Students and faculty used to see the course evaluation in Peoplesoft, but now we have the Course Evaluation System. This new system is really not a lot different from the student perspective, except that the Course Evaluation System has a mobile app.

Comparing the responses from Fall 2016 to the current responses for last semester, SERB has found that the response rate is comparable. There was a 73.5% response rate in Fall 2016 with Peoplesoft, and there was a 76.8% response rate last semester with the Course Evaluation System. What SERB is seeing here is that there isn't a dramatic decrease in the response rate. The response rate last semester is also comparable to the paper response rate. The response rate with paper SOTES and SOLATES was about 73%. Student responses to the questions have not changed much as well, even though the questions have been changed a little. The mean to question 13 in Peoplesoft was

don't have that right now. Also, the visual representation of the department, college, and university norms as we used to see them. We used to have a pretty good visualization of all of them and now we just have the two norms (department and university)



something that simply had to be gotten out of the way, or a number of boxes that had to be checked before students could get on with their major. That is a perception we need to change. We have been looking at a number of campuses throughout the CSU and the way they present GE. One of the most striking things is that when you can find GE listed for the campuses, it states that these are the requirements and not learning opportunities.

Senator Rodan came from the British education system which does not have any GE component, so he spent his entire UG degree in math and physics courses. What he has come to realize while at SJSU is how much richer his education would have been if he had the opportunity to take some of the courses he sees in our GE program. One of the first things we need to think about if we are going to change this perception on campus is reimagining the website. We've got to sell GE as something students want to do and not something they have to do. One of the things that came out of the external reviewer's report is that they were less than enthusiastic about our assessment protocol. BOGS is going to revisit what they are assessing and how that assessment is being done, and in particular



**Executive Committee Minutes  
March 5, 2018, 2018  
Noon – 1:30 p.m., ADM 167**

Present: Shifflett, Manzo, Schultz-Krohn, Mathur, Lee, Feinstein, Sullivan-Green, Wong(Lau), Riley, Peter, Faas, Papazian

Absent: Frazier, Manzo, Van Selst

1. The minutes of February 19, 2018 were approved as amended.
2. There was no dissent to the consent calendar of March 5, 2018 as amended.
3. Update from the President:  
The President will be attending CSU Advocacy Day on March 7, 2018 in Sacramento. The President reminded committee members that the CSU has a \$171 million budgetary gap between the budget the Governor is proposing and what the CSU needs to operate.

The Board of Trustees (BOT) meet at the end of the month and one item on the agenda is a tuition increase. No one wants a tuition increase, but the budget gap is very large. The legislature is budgeting for next year, but the question is

just how much of a challenge it will be. Can communication on campus be specific with respect to the deficit between the Governor's budget and what the needs?

President Papazian is planning town hall meetings on campus in the next month and will be sharing the numbers. Without substantial change by the end of the year, programs such as student success initiatives and faculty hiring will be

President asked if there were any questions or suggestions regarding the graffiti with the graffiti on the DMH bathroom wall.







7. O&G asked that the referral made to the Senate Chair regarding establishing student awards for service on the Senate be made a priority. The student member of O&G consulted with AS peers and concurred further investigation a good idea.

The Senate Administrator responded that there is already a University Policy that pertains to these awards and it is University Policy S97-4, University Governance Award. In addition, certificates of service are presented to all departing Senators at the end of the year.

8. University Updates:

- a. CSU Statewide Senators:

The CSU Statewide Senate will be discussing modality of instruction. This pertains to deans in some instances forcing lecturers to teach online courses.

The Provost will do some investigation and develop a plan for online courses.

~~From the Provost and Senor (April 07 Academic Affairs)-6 (pe (w)-0.6 l)-07-2avos. 12 Tw -1p6: (e)~~

the charge will be annual awards to recognize good work in diversity across the

**Executive Committee Minutes  
March 19, 2018  
Noon – 1:30 p.m., ADM 167**

Present: Shifflett, Manzo, Schultz-Krohn, Mathur, Lee, Feinstein, Sullivan-Green, Wong(Lau), Riley, Peter, Faas, Papazian, Frazier, Manzo, Van Selst

Absent: None

1. The minutes of March 5, 2018 were approved as amended



b.

18,000 freshmen have been admitted.

Admitted Spartans Day is April 14, 2018.

7. Policy Committee Updates:

a. From the Professional Standards Committee (PS):

PS will be bringing the Academic Freedom policy to the Senate for a final reading at the April 9, 2018 meeting.

PS is also working on a Professional Responsibility policy to be brought to the Senate at a later date.

PS is researching bullying.

PS will be bringing a policy on RTP guidelines.

b. From the Organization and Government Committee (O&G):

O&G will be bringing an amendment to the voting rights policy to the Senate at the April 9, 2018 meeting.

c. From the Curriculum and Research Committee (C&R):

C&R has been reviewing Marine Biology and the restructuring of Engineering degrees.

C&R continues to collaborate on the 4+1 blended BS-to-MS degree and is discussing with the UCCD.

C&R is also working on a referral regarding the chairs of thesis committees.

d. From the Instruction and Student Affairs Committee (I&SA):

I&SA is revisiting the question of policy S66-20 and trying to determine what should come first the Presidential Directive or the policy.

I&SA is reviewing the registration policy regarding students repeating classes.



8. The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

These minutes were transcribed by the Senate Administrator, Eva Joice, on  
March 23, 2018

	Committee	Consent Calendar Last Name/First Name	9-Apr-18 Term	Phone	Seat/College
ADD:	Program Planning	Lee, Juneseok	2019	<a href="mailto:juneseok.lee@sj">JUNESEOK LEE &lt;juneseok.lee@sj&gt;</a>	M/ CoEng
	Writing Requirements Committee	Wells, Pamela	2021		CoB
	Writing Requirements Committee	McConnell, Kathleen	2021		CoSS
	Writing Requirements Committee	Frazier, Stefan	2021		H&A/LLD
	Writing Requirements Committee	Baer, Cindy	2019		H&A
	Student Fairness Committee	Khalil, Malaak	2018	<a href="mailto:malaak.khalil@sjsu.edu">malaak.khalil@sjsu.edu</a>	Seat 2
	ULB	Ramsour, Mariah	2018	<a href="mailto:mariah.ramsour@gmail.com">mariah.ramsour@gmail.com</a>	Seat 2
REMOVE:	Student Fairness Committee	Castillo, Efrain	2018		Seat 2
	BOGS	Gonzales, Samantha	2018		Seat 1
	ADAPC	Woodhead, Erin	2020		Seat K





**SAN JOSÉ STATE  
UNIVERSITY**

**Academic Senate Office**

ADM 176, 0024

**GENERAL ELECTIONS**  
2019 Calendar

Timeline	Election Events
Thursday, January 31	Cover letter with instructions and petitions sent to all faculty. Petitions on line/attached.
Friday, February 22	Nominating petitions due in Senate Office (ADM 176).

Monday - Friday  
February 25 – March 2, 2019

Approved: March 16, 2018  
Committee on Committees

Approved: March 19, 2018  
Executive Committee

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_  
Academic Senate

1 San Jose State University  
2 Academic Senate  
3 Organization and Government Committee  
4 April 9, 2018  
5 Final Reading  
6

AS 1678

7 **Policy Recommendation**  
8 **Amendment A to S17-6**  
9 **(Departmental Voting Rights)**  
10

Legislative History:



6  
7  
8  
9  
10 **Policy Recommendation**  
11 **Amends University Policies S99-8 and S99-9**  
12 **Declaring our Support for Academic Freedom and**  
13 **Establishing the Academic Freedom Committee**

14 Resolved: That this policy be adopted effective immediately, with the Academic  
15 Freedom Committee to be established by the beginning of AY 2018-19.

16 Resolved: Section I of S99-8 shall be deleted (as it is incorporated here unchanged.)  
17 The title of S99-8 shall be changed from "Academic Freedom and  
18 Professional Responsibility" to "Professional Responsibility."  
19

20 Resolved: Throughout S99-9 the name of the "Board of Academic Freedom and  
21 Professional Responsibility" shall be changed to the "Board of  
22 Professional Responsibility." Items 1, 2, and 3 of its charge (related to the  
23 education about Academic Freedom) will be deleted (as they are  
24 incorporated here.)  
25  
26

27 Rationale: Academic Freedom is at the heart of the success of the modern university,  
28 but in recent years faculty, students, and others have begun to lose touch  
29 touch with a fulsome understanding of this critical concept. The classic  
30 statements in defense of academic freedom were articulated at the start of  
31 the twentieth century by the American Association of University Professors  
32 (AAUP) in response to egregious acts in which faculty appointments,  
33 research programs, and curricular content were attacked or manipulated  
34 for political reasons. Faculty organized and fought hard to secure tenure  
35 and other protections, and by the 1950s they won a key court decision that  
36 eloquently summarized the need for academic freedom. "Teachers and  
37 students must always remain free to inquire, to study and to evaluate, to  
38 gain new maturity and understanding; otherwise our civilization will  
39 stagnate and die."<sup>1</sup> [[Sweezy v. New Hampshire, 34 U.S. 234, 250 \(1957\)](#)]  
40

41 Today, however, many faculty and others are apt not to know much about  
42 the history of academic freedom, nor its legal status, nor its ultimate  
43 purpose. When the term is used it is sometimes perceived incorrectly as

---

1." [[Sweezy v. New Hampshire, 34 U.S. 234, 250 \(1957\)](#)]

44 an individual privilege rather than as a critically important tool for fulfilling  
45 the academy's scholarly and educational roles. Professional Standards  
46 believes it is the responsibility of each new generation of faculty to take on  
47 the challenge of renewing the community's understanding of academic  
48 freedom, and has crafted this policy recommendation to fulfill this task.

49  
50 A generation ago, the Academic Senate combined the Academic Freedom  
51 Committee with a new board focused on professional ethics. The  
52 motivation was sound—to symbolize the deep interconnection of  
53 academic freedom to professional responsibility. We continue to agree  
54 with this principle, but experience has taught that the Board of Academic  
55 Freedom and Professional Responsibility (BAFPR) has not been a  
consistently effective committee. Its sweeping responsibilities, exte( )0.7 (t)qhd1.217 -0





112 **Policy Recommendation**  
113 **Academic Freedom at SJSU**

114  
115 1. Statement of Academic Freedom<sup>2</sup>

116  
117 1.1. In General

118  
119 1.1.1. The primary mandates of a university—the discovery and dissemination of  
120 knowledge and understanding, are absolutely dependent upon academic  
121 and intellectual freedom. Freedom in research is fundamental to the  
122 advancement of truth. Freedom in teaching is fundamental for the  
123 protection of the rights of the student in learning and of the faculty<sup>3</sup> in  
124 teaching.

125 1.1.2. San José State University has a responsibility to protect and promote the  
rights of its faculty and students to academic freedom. This responsibility is  
enshrined in the university's policies and procedures, including the  
San José State University Academic Freedom Policy (SJSU AFP) and the  
San José State University Faculty Handbook. The university's commitment  
to academic freedom is a cornerstone of its mission and values.

1.2.

148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155

### 1.3. Academic Freedom as it Relates to Professional Responsibility

1.3.1. Professional responsibility is the natural complement of the academic freedom essential to the university's mission. Through their responsible professional conduct, faculty members promote and protect academic freedom. Since faculty members belong to a profession with the rights of self-government, they also have the obligation to establish standards of professional conduct and procedures to enforce them. These standards are set in the SJSU Statement of Professional Respon7 (uc)-6 (t)-116 (m)-6.n2(s)-6 (eu6 (r)-6.4



1 SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY  
2 Academic Senate  
3 Professional Standards Committee  
4 April 9, 2018  
5 Final Reading

AS 1683

6  
7  
8 **POLICY RECOMMENDATION**

9 **Amendment A to F81-7**

10 **“Appointment Procedures for Grant-Related Instructional  
11 Faculty of Exceptional Merit” (GRIF)**

12  
13  
14 Resolved: That F81-7 be amended with the revisions shown, effective immediately.

15  
16 *Rationale: F81-7 is our campus policy regulating the appointment of a very small  
17 number of faculty who are appointed with annual salary supplements above  
18 that of the CSU/CFA contract. There are at present only 2 such faculty at  
19 SJSU. The number of these faculty are limited to 100 system wide, and the  
20 size of their supplementary salary is currently limited to 5-35% of their  
21 normal salary. The supplements are paid by non-state dollars, including  
22 grants, gifts, or foundation resources, and are designed “to permit  
23 campuses to appoint individuals of regional and national professional  
24 stature.” These have become known as Grant-Related Instructional Faculty  
25 (GRIF.)*

26  
27 *This program is nearly 40 years old and is currently regulated by CSU  
28 coded memorandum HR 2005-37. The coded memo requires that  
29 campuses create their own procedures for the selection of GRIF faculty,  
30 and F81-7 is our campus’s document to comply with this system  
31 requirement.*



2.3.

1 San Jose State University  
2 Academic Senate  
3 Instruction & Student Affairs  
4 April 9 , 2018  
Final Reading

AS 1686

11  
12 Whereas, The Selective Service System does not currently classify registrants, and  
13  
14 Whereas, The Selective Service System does not have criteria regarding a reporting  
mechanism or required information t



1 SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY  
2 Academic Senate  
3 Curriculum and Research Committee  
4 April 9, 2018  
5 First Reading  
6

AS 1688

7 POLICY RECOMMENDATION  
8 Rescind F83-10 Entry - Level Mathematics (ELM) Examination;  
9 Sanctions; Probation

10 Rationale : Executive Order 1110, issued by the Chancellor on August 2, 2017,  
11 discontinued, with immediate effect, the offering of the English Placement Test (EPT)  
12 and the Entry- Level Mathematics (ELM) Test. SJSU Policy F83-10 stipulates that  
13 students who are required to take the ELM test must do so during their first semester of  
14 enrollment. This requirement conflicts with EO 1110.

15 Whereas: [Executive Order 1110](#) discontinued the offering of the English Placement  
16 Test (EPT) and the Entry- Level Mathematics (ELM) Test effective August  
17 2, 2017, and

18 Whereas: [F83-10](#) stipulates that students who are required to take the ELM test  
19 must do so during their first semester of enrollment, therefore be it

20 Resolved : that F83-10 be rescinded.

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Approved: March 5, 2018  
35 Vote: 13-0-0  
36 Present: Bacich, Buzanski, Cargill, Chung, Jensen, Heil, Matoush, Stacks,  
37 Rodan, Trulio, Schultz-Krohn, Anagnos, De Guzman  
38 Absent: None  
39 Workload Impact: None  
40 Financial Impact: None

41

1 SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY  
2 Academic Senate  
3 Curriculum and Research Committee  
4 April 9, 2018  
5 First Reading  
6  
7

AS 1689

8 POLICY RECOMMENDATION

9 Rescind S80-9 Resource Analysis Required for Curricular Proposals

10

11 Legislative History: S80-9 outlined the specific forms to be used for curricular proposals  
12 and directed new courses to use a specific proposal form.

13

Whereas: Curricular proposals are typically initiated at the department/school, and

- 1 SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
- 2 Academic Senate
- 3 Professional Standards Committee

April 9U.Tt[TJ 40 Tw 8.2 /Ty05 -1.15 c 08 Tc 0 Tw 16.617/ (s )iTT 40 Tw 8ID 18-1.15 c 08 Tc 0 Tw 16.6

is so specific that it rapidly becomes inflexible or obsolete? We responded in the following way:

- x We have crafted flexible language that allows the President and the Chair of the Senate to create committees and processes as

- 46 x We record this language in the campus awards policy, where it
- 47 plausible fits and where it will not be misplaced.
- 48 x We harness, when possible, synchronicity between the campus
- 49 awards process and recipients to assist the nominations for system
- 50 awards or the construction of system award committees.
- 51

52 In addition to the amendments designed to address the need for system award  
53 nominations, Professional Standards recommends several minor editorial amendments  
54 designed to update the awards policy. For example, since 2013 we have adopted a  
55 new RTP policy and the term “academic assignment” is becoming less useful and well  
56 understood since we now have separate categories for teaching and service. This term  
57 was replaced in the Outstanding Professor section with “teaching and service to  
58 students.” Similarly, we have more prominently highlighted the requirement for tenure  
59 for several of the awards—they have always required tenure but this was buried in the  
60 fine print, leading to some confusion.

61  
62 Approved: (March 5, 2018)

63  
64 Vote: (10-0-0)

65 Present: (Chin, He, Marachi, Kauppila, McKee, Whi(a)-16.6 (,)-Tc 0 Tw -2.5 0 0.006 Tc t:i,(



121  
122

- b. For the Outstanding Lecturer Award, a lecturer must have been at SJSU for at least six semesters.
- c. For the President's Scholar award, the Outstanding Professor







a.

To recognize a tenured



- 376 a. Advising students through student organizations and/or other  
377 projects.
- 378 b. Participating in student orientation and advisement activities.
- 379 c. Mentoring students regarding career and graduate school  
380 considerations.
- 381 d. Engaging in service to the campus and/or profession that benefits  
382 students.
- 383 3. Contributions Beyond Teaching – which might be evidenced by  
384 consistency of:
  - 385 a. Service on university, college and/or department committees or  
386 projects that provide a meaningful benefit to the campus.
  - 387 b. Service to the campus or profession that demonstrates leadership  
388 and initiative.
  - 389 c. High quality scholarship, performances, or creative activities.

390 C. Selection Committee

391 The Selection Committee shall consist of three prior recipients of the  
392 award, one student, and one administrator. All shall be voting members of  
393 the committee. The administrator shall serve as chair of the committee.  
394

8 >>B395w 3W1.133 General Guidelines for MCI/P <</MCI 0 Td 678 >>BDC /TT1 1 Tf -0.D 8 >>B39w 10.5 -2.317

- 410 (unranked) to the President by the date established by the President in  
411 conjunction with each committee chair but no later than March 1.  
412
- 413 2. The Office of Faculty Affairs can assist the committee if it needs to  
414 verify the eligibility of any nominee.  
415
  - 416 3. If the committee determines that the number of nominees is greater  
417 than the number who should be asked for further documentation, a  
418 "first cut" should be made based on the nominating letters. If the  
419 committee determines that an insufficient number of nominations have  
420 been made, it should consult with the Chair of the Senate about  
421 sending out another request for nominations.  
422
  - 423 4. Decide what additional documentation should be requested from  
424 nominees, such as letters of recommendation or a personal statement.  
425 At a minimum, nominees are to submit a curriculum vitae. A discussion  
426 of the purpose of the award and the criteria (as set out in this policy)  
427 should help the committee in deciding upon the documentation to  
428 request.  
429
  - 430 5. Decide upon an approach for reviewing the nomination letters and the  
431 information provided by nominees, and for selecting the top three  
432 nominees.  
433
  - 434 6. After the top three nominees have been selected, a summary of the  
435 significant qualifications of each should be forwarded to the President's  
436 Office along with the nominating letters and information provided by  
437 each of the three nominees. The three nominees submitted to the  
438 President should be unranked. If the committee determines there are  
439 fewer than three qualified candidates, then fewer than three nominees  
440 should be forwarded. If the committee determines that there is no  
441 qualified candidate, then no names should be forwarded and the award  
442 not given in that year.  
443
  - 444 7. The committee chair should arrange for mailing of letters to nominees  
445 to request additional information, as well as thank you letters upon  
446 completion of the process. The President's Office will also send a  
447 congratulatory letter to the recipient of the award, and optionally, to the  
448 other two finalists.  
449
  - 450 8. Committee members are to maintain confidentiality of the nominee  
451 names, documentation, and evaluation comments.  
452

VIII.

454  
455  
456

A. Purpose. From time to time the CSU requests faculty nominees for various system-wide awards (e.g., the Wang awards.) Sometimes these requests ar

495

496 Appendix

497

498 Nomination Form for Outstanding Professor, President's Scholar, Distinguished Service  
499 Award, and Outstanding Lecturer Award

500

501 Instructions:

502

503 • Before completing this form, please read the eligibility criteria for each award outlined  
504 in UP S00-9 available at [http://www.sjsu.edu/senate/policies/pol\\_chron/index](http://www.sjsu.edu/senate/policies/pol_chron/index).

• Please use a separate form for each nominee.

1 SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY  
2 Academic Senate  
3 Curriculum and Research Committee  
4 April 9, 2018  
5 First Reading  
6  
7

AS 1691

8 POLICY RECOMMENDATION  
9 Rescind University Policy S09 -5 - Priority Registration  
10

11 ~~¿í:°±ã | S09-5 Name Under S97-1, and~~

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

Whereas: S97-1 set the order for priority registration, and  
Whereas: the order for priority registration is now defined in F17-4, therefore be it  
Resolved: that S09-5 be rescinded.

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

Approved: 4-2-2018  
Vote: 13-0-0  
Present: Anagnos, Bacich, Buzanski, Cargill, Chung, De Guzman, Heil,  
Jensen, Matoush, Rodan, Schultz-Krohn, Stacks, Trulio  
Absent: None  
Workload Impact: None anticipated  
Financial Impact: None anticipated



1 San José State University  
2 Academic Senate  
3 University Library Board  
April 9, 2018

AS 1692

25 Whereas: Open access contributes to global information sharing, including  
26 developing countries that do not have access to expensive databases or  
27 journal subscriptions<sup>9</sup>; and  
28 Whereas: Open access increases author flexibility to manage works after publication  
29 via increased retention of author rights<sup>10</sup>; and  
30  
31 Whereas: SJSU Library staff already facilitate deposit of faculty publications in SJSU  
32 ScholarWorks<sup>11</sup>, the SJSU digital repository, with minimal time investment  
33 by faculty; therefore so be it  
34  
35 Resolved: That the Academic Senate of SJSU encourages SJSU faculty to continue  
36 seeking high quality and rigorous peer-reviewed journals to publish their  
37 scholarly work that are broadly recognized by scholarly communities as  
38 suitable to meet the standards of promotion and tenure, and be it  
39  
40 Resolved: That retention, tenure, and promotion committees consider faculty work  
41 published in open access and controlled access venues as equivalent,  
42 while using discipline-specific criteria to evaluate quality, value, and  
43 impact; and be it  
44  
45 Resolved: That SJSU faculty become aware of current open access options:  
46 a. Green Access - Journals that allow for self-archiving of pre- or post-  
47 prints in repositories<sup>12</sup>  
48 b. Gold - Journals that are fully open access<sup>13</sup>  
49 c. Hybrid - Journals that contain a mix of traditional subscription articles  
50 alongside open access articles, and be it  
51  
52 Resolved: That SJSU faculty seek to retain as many rights as they can during the  
53 publishing process to ensure greater control over the potential for  
54 academic and public access to the research (see [SPARC Author](#)  
55 [Addendum](#)), including retaining rights to deposit pre- or post-prints into  
56 ScholarWorks, the campus institutional repository, and be it  
57

---

<sup>9</sup> Chan, L., Kirsop, B 53 SJ pe /Paginatio0300/jeTm O 11 -02.0eposTj 0 tjeTm tje26.4 ( ) 140.61kj 0 tjeTm Tm136.bu 136

58 Resolved: That the Academic Senate of SJSU encourages the Chancellor's Office to  
59 consider a [University of California \(UC\)-style Open Access policy](#) that  
60 ensures equitable and open access dissemination of faculty scholarship.  
61

62  
63  
64  
65

66 Approved: Monday, April 2, 2018  
67 Vote: 7-0-0  
68 Present: Bodart, Gaylle, Khavul, Sasikumar, Smith, Taylor, Tian, Elliott (non-  
69 voting)  
70 Absent: Megwalu, Borchard, Villena, Villanueva, Kim, Cabrera, Lee  
71 Financial Impact: None  
72 Workload Impact: None



45 achieve the work outlined in its charge is to have members include those directly involved in health/wellness programs,

Alcohol

RA Student

141 Following implementation, if modifications to this policy appear needed, the ADAP  
142 committee co-chairs will provide the Academic Senate Chair with the committee's  
143 suggestions. The Chair of the Academic Senate will then refer the recommendation(s)  
144 out to the appropriate policy committee for timely review and subsequent action.  
145





42 Present: Anagnos, Bacich, Buzanski, Cargill, Chung, De Guzman, Heil,  
43 Jensen, Matoush, Rodan, Schultz-Krohn, Stacks, Trulio  
44  
45 Absent: None  
46  
47 Workload Impact: Increase workload for MPP serving as Committee Chair for a  
48 Thesis/Dissertation  
49  
50 Financial Impact: None anticipated

SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY



1 SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY  
2 Academic Senate

AS 1696